



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

FSC.AIAM/27/10

15 March 2010

ENGLISH only

TWENTIETH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING

Vienna, 2 and 3 March 2010

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY

OPENING SESSION

REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS

CLOSING SESSION

REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE CLOSING SESSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Decision No. 6/09 on the dates and the venue of the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	1
Decision No. 10/09 on the agenda and modalities of the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	2
Annotated agenda and indicative timetable of the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	6
Opening session	
Statement by the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Cyprus to the OSCE in his capacity as the chairperson of the opening and working sessions of the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	11
Statement by the Permanent Representative of Greece, Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation, at the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	14
Presentation of the CPC summary report at the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting by the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre.....	16
Report of the third meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres to the AIAM by the senior FSC Support Officer	19
Reports of the working session rapporteurs	
Working session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions	23
Working session 1 (continued): Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions	28
Working session 2: Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: Clarification, assessment and conclusions	32
Working session 3: Suggestions aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs	35
Closing session	
Remarks by the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Croatia to the OSCE in his capacity as the chairperson of the closing session of the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	43
Report by the chairperson of the closing session	
Report to the Forum for Security Co-operation on the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting by the chairperson of the closing session	51



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

FSC.DEC/6/09
30 September 2009

Original: ENGLISH

589th Plenary Meeting

FSC Journal No. 595, Agenda item 2

**DECISION No. 6/09
DATES AND VENUE OF THE TWENTIETH
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING**

The Forum for Security Co-operation,

Decides that the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) will be held on 2 and 3 March 2010 in Vienna.



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

FSC.DEC/10/09
25 November 2009

Original: ENGLISH

596th Plenary Meeting

FSC Journal No. 602, Agenda item 4

**DECISION No. 10/09
AGENDA AND MODALITIES OF THE TWENTIETH
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING**

2 and 3 March 2010

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.*
- (150) *The Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) will hold such meetings. It will consider, as required, suggestions made during the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs.*

In addition to the provisions contained in the Vienna Document itself and set out above the meeting provides an opportunity for a broader assessment of implementation of agreed CSBMs and other FSC-agreed measures/documents.

I. Agenda and indicative timetable

Tuesday, 2 March 2010

10–11 a.m. Opening session

- Opening of the meeting by the Chairperson;
- Remarks by the Chairperson of the FSC;

- Presentation of a summary report by the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC);
 - Presentation of a report by the CPC on the meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres held on 14 December 2009 (FSC.DEC/4/09).
- 11.30 a.m.–6 p.m. Working session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions
- Vienna Document 1999:
 - Annual exchange of military information;
 - Defence planning;
 - Risk reduction;
 - Military activities:
 - (i) Prior notification of certain military activities;
 - (ii) Annual calendars;
 - (iii) Constraining provisions;
 - (iv) Observation of certain military activities;
 - Contacts:
 - (i) Best Practice Guide on Contacts;
 - Evaluation;
 - Inspection;
 - Regional measures;
 - Communications Network.
 - GEMI.
- 1–3 p.m. Lunch break
- 3–6 p.m. Working session 1 (continued)

Wednesday, 3 March 2010

- 10 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session 2: Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: Clarification, assessment and conclusions
- Principles governing conventional arms transfers;
 - Principles governing non-proliferation;
 - Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations;
 - Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines;
 - Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security;
 - OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW);
 - OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition;
 - Principles for export controls of MANPADS;
 - Principles on the control of brokering in SALW;
 - Standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports.

1–3 p.m.	Lunch break
3–4.30 p.m.	Working session 3: Suggestions aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs
5–6 p.m.	Closing session
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Discussion;– Concluding remarks;– Closure.

II. Organizational modalities

1. The AIAM will last two days and will have opening and closing sessions, as well as working sessions, dealing with 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 Monday, 1 March 2010, at 3 p.m.

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

3. Interpretation into the OSCE official languages will be provided at all sessions of the AIAM.

4. The sessions will be chaired by representatives of the participating States, in rotation, in accordance with the French alphabetical order, following on from the chairing of the closing plenary meeting of the 2009 AIAM by Canada. The chair of the opening session and working sessions will be held by Cyprus. The chair of the closing session will be held by Croatia.

5. Debates in the working sessions will be oriented towards problems and solutions and there will be no formal statements. Any national statements for the opening session should be presented in written form only 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 items and on related matters for possible discussion. All delegations are strongly encouraged to provide national experts to participate in the AIAM.

6. To serve as a basis for preparatory work by delegations and co-ordinators, the CPC will circulate no later than 12 February 2010:

- The revised Annual Survey on CSBM Information Exchanged and the AIAM Survey of Suggestions 2009;

- A summary report on recent trends in the implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and other measures;
 - A summary report on the meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres held on 14 December 2009.
7. Working session 1 will have two designated co-ordinators and two rapporteurs while working sessions 2 and 3 will have one co-ordinator and one rapporteur. The task of the co-ordinators will be to facilitate the discussion, while the immediate task of the rapporteurs will be to present a brief written summary report for use by the Chairperson of the closing session.
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. The co-ordinators are also encouraged to focus discussions on suggestions that might be supported by delegations.
9. Delegations that have volunteers to act as co-ordinators or/and rapporteurs for the working sessions should provide the names of the individuals to the Chairperson of the FSC as soon as possible, but no later than 12 February 2010. The names of the co-ordinators and rapporteurs for each working session will be made known to all delegations no later than 15 February 2010.
10. During the first FSC plenary meeting following the AIAM, the Chairperson of the closing session will report on the AIAM to the FSC and provide the Chairperson's report together with the reports of the rapporteurs of the working sessions. Rapporteurs are encouraged to circulate their reports to those participating States that contributed to the relevant working session. Within a month after the AIAM the CPC will circulate a written report on suggestions made during the Meeting aimed at improving the implementation of CSBMs.
11. The approach recommended in order to ensure the most productive discussion in the FSC when the participating States consider, as required, suggestions for improvement of the implementation of CSBMs made during the Meeting, 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.
12. The agenda and dates of the 2011 AIAM will be agreed by a decision in the FSC before the end of 2010.
13. The Partners for Co-operation and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly are invited to attend all sessions of the 2010 AIAM.

ANNOTATED AGENDA AND INDICATIVE TIMETABLE OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING

2 and 3 March 2010

Tuesday, 2 March 2010

10–11 a.m. Opening session

Chairperson: Cyprus (also chairing the working sessions)

- Opening of the meeting by the Chairperson;
- Remarks by the Chairperson of the FSC;
- Presentation of a summary report by the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC);
- Presentation of a report by the CPC on the meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres held on 14 December 2009 (FSC.DEC/4/09).

11:30 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions

Co-ordinator: Mr. F. Pilot (Luxembourg)

Rapporteur: Mr. C. Aguado Valladares (Spain)

- Vienna Document 1999:
 - 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;

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

3–6 p.m. Working session 1 (continued)

Co-ordinator: Mr. L. Simonet (France)

Rapporteur: Ms. K. Zakova (Slovakia)

- Vienna Document 1999:
 - Contacts;
 - i) Best Practice Guide on Contacts;

- Evaluation;
- Inspection;
- Regional measures;
- Communications Network;

- GEMI.

Wednesday, 3 March 2010

10 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session 2: Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: Clarification, assessment and conclusions

Co-ordinator: Mr. S. Hartnell (United Kingdom)

Rapporteur: Mr. A. Byren (Sweden)

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

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

3–4.30 p.m. Working session 3: Suggestions aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs

Co-ordinator: Mr. P. von Arx (Switzerland)

Rapporteur: Ms. S. Rossion (Belgium)

5–6 p.m. Closing session

Chairperson: Croatia

- Discussion;
- Concluding remarks;
- Closure.

OPENING SESSION

**STATEMENT BY
THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REPUBLIC OF
CYPRUS TO THE OSCE IN HIS CAPACITY AS THE CHAIRPERSON
OF THE OPENING AND WORKING SESSIONS OF THE TWENTIETH
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING**

Vienna, 2 March 2010

Distinguished delegates,
Dear colleagues,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to welcome you all to the 20th AIAM. Cyprus is honoured to chair the opening and working sessions of this important meeting, providing us the right occasion to discuss issues relating to the implementation of the politico-military dimension, as highlighted in the VD 99.

The implementation of the VD 99, is one of the vital tasks of this Organization. The assessment aspect of this meeting is instrumental in giving us the opportunity to identify necessary improvements and it enables us to take relevant steps towards that direction. The agenda of the FSC, often includes items aimed towards the promotion of the politico-military dimension in all its aspects, through consensus, common understanding, always paying the necessary attention to the conclusions of AIAM and Heads of Verification meetings.

A number of food-for-thought papers and proposals for draft decisions are already under consideration in the relevant FSC working groups. We wish to thank the States that have worked in preparing these documents, as well as all participating States for supporting and actively contributing to their improvement and possible adoption.

In the aftermath of the successful Athens ministerial meeting, the FSC began working immediately so as to prepare thoughts, ideas and suggestions aiming at improving our core document, the VD 99. The Corfu Process and Athens decisions have become a milestone in our way and a lighthouse for our future steps.

Our main intention during these two days is to assess and identify shortcomings in the implementation of the VD 99 for the year 2009, to evaluate last year's AIAM proposals and to generate new ideas for strengthening the Document.

The exchange of information in compliance with the VD, is of fundamental and utmost importance in the field of confidence- and security-building measures in the area of OSCE. The document constitutes a major success story for the OSCE. It embodies our shared values and contributes towards the creation of a more secure environment, by providing mutual recognition and respect, transparency, promoting understanding and building confidence. These values are advanced between us, while at the same time they are also shared with our Partners for Co-operation.

The very detailed and accurate report of the CPC, for which document we wish to express our thanks, verifies our continuous efforts towards improving compliance and thus achieving the aims of the VD 99.

During the third Heads of Verification Meeting, held last December, our experts from capitals were provided with the opportunity to discuss their own experience on the practical implementation of CSBMs. The report from the above mentioned meeting, will assist us in shaping today's discussions in having a productive and results-orientated debate.

Other FSC-agreed measures, such as the Code of Conduct, the small arms and light weapons and stockpiles of conventional ammunition, are also high on our agenda. Our ministers in Athens adopted relevant decisions and gave us clear instructions on how to proceed. The work accomplished by the FSC on these subjects is significant and the evaluation of the progress made, will also be part of the agenda of this AIAM.

2009 was characterized by the financial crisis, due to which all States had to adapt their budgets. It is a well known fact that the verification process carries a specific cost. Our Organizations' programmes are still running, however, additional funding is needed. Despite the budgetary implications, some destruction and elimination programmes, which were successfully concluded last year, proved that this Organization is dedicated in effectively producing pragmatic results. The above mentioned examples highlight the importance of security and confidence, beyond any financial cost.

In this context and in line with our agenda and modalities, we will review again this year the topics to be suggested by our co-ordinators. Food-for-thought papers, ideas and proposals are most welcomed. I encourage you all to participate in an active, fruitful and productive discussion, so as to take full advantage of the opportunities provided by this meeting. This will facilitate our "theoretical" work in the FSC, which in turn will facilitate the "practical" work of implementing the VD 99. This will benefit each and every State, and will have an impact on the prosperity of our people who wish to live in a more secure OSCE area.

Before closing, let me address in advance my thanks, to all those who directly or indirectly have worked hard to support the preparation of this meeting and will continue to work for its successful outcome, namely,

- The FSC Chair;
- The CPC;
- The Secretariat;
- Our co-ordinators and rapporteurs;
- And finally our interpreters.

I wish you all fruitful deliberations.

Allow me now to pass the floor to my distinguished colleague,
Ambassador Mara Marinaki, Permanent Representative of Greece and Chairperson of the
FSC.

Ambassador, the floor is yours.

Thank you all.

**STATEMENT BY
THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF GREECE,
CHAIRPERSON OF THE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION,
AT THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION
ASSESSMENT MEETING**

Vienna, 2 March 2010

Mr. Chairperson,
Distinguished delegates,
Dear colleagues,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is my special pleasure to take the floor, as Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation, at this opening session of the 20th Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting. The AIAM remains one of the major events in the OSCE calendar and one of the most important ones in the work of the FSC.

It provides an opportunity for a comprehensive assessment of the work of the FSC and the implementation of the arrangements agreed in its framework. We should not forget that the AIAM itself is a confidence- and security-building measure: it is mandated by Chapter XI of the Vienna Document and it aims at discussing the present and future implications of agreed CSBMs, at clarifying questions from such implementation, and at examining the operation of agreed measures as well as the implications of all information originating from the implementation of the CSBMs. Beyond its original mandate, the AIAM expanded subsequently to include the programme review of all documents and measures adopted by the FSC, and, thus, AIAM became the major event to review implementation of our common politico-military commitments and chart the way forward.

Chapter XI of the VD 99 indicates that AIAM is designed in such a way so as to:

- (a) Promote understanding and dispel any concerns deriving from the information exchanged over the previous year. It is clear that the clarification of relevant questions should be done in a spirit of partnership and in good faith;
- (b) Provide assistance to the participating States which were not able to fulfil their commitments; and
- (c) Foster implementation by all.

The need for implementation, in good faith by all participating States, can't be overemphasized. Numerous OSCE documents make a direct link between implementation of all agreed CSBMs and security and stability in the OSCE area. If the VD 99 is the "jewel of the OSCE crown" as has been repeatedly stated, then the degree of its implementation indicates the state of affairs in our co-operative security.

In this context, this year's AIAM provides us with an important – perhaps a unique – opportunity to engage anew in strengthening our politico-military toolbox. Building on the

mandate of the relevant Athens Ministerial decisions and the impetus of the Corfu Process, we have the opportunity to explore ways in which to strengthen the Vienna Document 1999 as well as to promote a Plan of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons. Nevertheless, in the framework of these ambitious endeavours we believe that we should not lose sight of the basics: the value of implementation of already agreed commitments, by all in good faith and without any discrimination. At first glance, the degree of implementation is quite high; but, we can fare better. In this regard, I would like, in my capacity as FSC Chairperson, to remind the participating States which have not exchanged their annual information data and have not provided an explanation, under the FSC announcing and reminding mechanism, that, according to paragraph 150.4 of the VD 99, they are expected to explain the reasons and provide an expected date for their compliance with this commitment, during the AIAM.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Every year, the AIAM provides a platform for the presentation of ideas and proposals in order to improve the implementation and the operation of our CSBMs. Looking back to the list of suggestions, we find many ideas aiming at improving the operation of the VD 99 as well as strengthening our work on small arms and light weapons. This year, we have the opportunity to revisit some of these ideas with a new, more forthcoming, approach. At the same time, with the aim of taking our work forward, we should examine these ideas and proposals in light of the food-for-thought papers currently under discussion in the FSC. We are grateful to our partners who took the initiative and presented concrete proposals for a possible way forward in the implementation of the Athens Ministerial decision on issues relevant to the FSC.

In conclusion, I would like to welcome the experts from capitals and to invite all delegations present to use this year's AIAM as a real opportunity to share experiences from the operation of our CSBMs so far and work together for shaping the future. I believe that the excellent food-for-thought papers prepared by our most able co-ordinators will provide enough impetus for an interactive and forward-looking debate. On behalf of the FSC Chairmanship, I would like to express our gratitude to the chairs of the 2010 AIAM, Cyprus and Croatia, the co-ordinators and the rapporteurs and the FSC Support Unit of the CPC for their co-operation in preparation of this event. I wish you all every success.

**PRESENTATION OF THE
CPC SUMMARY REPORT AT THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL
IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING BY THE DIRECTOR
OF THE CONFLICT PREVENTION CENTRE**

2 March 2010

Mr. Chairperson, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to address this year's Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting. In my intervention, I will first present a few conclusions based on the Summary Report on Recent Trends of CSBM Implementation, which has been distributed by the CPC with reference number FSC.GAL19/10. Secondly, I will highlight some of the tasks that CPC has undertaken since the last AIAM to support the work of the FSC.

After the Athens Ministerial Council, the FSC has engaged in discussions on how to update the Vienna Document 1999 in a targeted manner. This year already two concrete proposals have been made, and the participating States have engaged in a constructive dialogue on the way forward. I hope that this work will bring tangible results to ensure the validity of the VD in the current security situation. In this light, I would like to start with some observations regarding the provisions of the VD and try to focus on trends that might be useful for your considerations.

Year 2009 was again an active year in terms of verification measures under Chapter IX. The participating States conducted 96 inspections and 46 evaluations, which is less than in 2008, but still beyond the past five year average as can be seen from the first slide. In addition, 11 inspections and 25 evaluations following regional or bilateral agreements were conducted. Following the trend of recent years, no military activities or major discrepancies were reported.

Several participating States have in different occasions noted the problem of the so-called quota race, referring to the early exhaustion of quotas that prevent many countries from conducting visits later on in the year. Again this year, the majority of the inspection and evaluation visits concentrated on the first half of the year, with fewer activities in the autumn as can be seen from the chart. On the other hand, a majority of the regional or bilateral visits were organised towards the end of the year to balance the situation.

A partial solution to the quota race has also been sought by deploying multinational verification teams to enable more participating States to conduct visits of their interest. In 2009, the possibility to invite guest inspectors and evaluators were increasingly used and over half of the inspection teams were composed of representatives of more than one nationality.

Another trend that can be detected from the report is the increase in the prior notification of major military activities. In 2009, a total of 15 participating States sent a prior notification. Out of these, 13 countries gave the information on a voluntary basis following the FSC Chair's statement from 2005. This number is significantly higher than in 2008 (7 participating States) and it seems that the trend will continue this year with already 13 prior notifications.

Regarding the exchanges of military information in 2009, two major trends can be highlighted. Firstly, there was an increasing non-compliance with the deadlines as can be seen from this slide. In several cases, the majority of replies were delayed and the FSC Chair made extensive use of the announcing and reminding mechanism. This applied particularly to the information exchanges on the Code of Conduct, conventional arms transfers and small arms and light weapons.

Secondly, the overall implementation level has remained relatively stable and high. In 2009, the number of submissions was either at the same or even higher level than in 2008. The greatest increase was with defence planning with six replies more than in 2008. The only exception was the Code of Conduct with five replies less than during the previous years. The number of replies will hopefully return back to the usual high level with the full introduction of the new questionnaire in the upcoming information exchange.

I would now like to turn to some of the undertakings of the CPC in the past year. Throughout 2009, the CPC has maintained records of the implementation of CSBMs and other FSC commitments and published monthly and quarterly reports. As the purpose of these reports is to serve as a background for discussions in Working Group A, the CPC would value delegations' feedback regarding these reports and how they could be made more user friendly.

In line with the FSC Decision No. 1/08 on the outreach and awareness-raising on the Code of Conduct, the CPC organized a regional seminar in Bosnia and Herzegovina and provided input to a national event in Montenegro. We continue to support the participating States in furthering the Code's implementation, including the recent proposal on a reference guide designed to help countries in their reporting.

In Turkmenistan, a training workshop on the confidence- and security-building measures and the implementation of the FSC documents, including the use of the OSCE Communications Network, was organized together with the Centre in Ashgabat.

Also small arms and light weapons were high on the agenda in 2009. In September, the CPC supported the OSCE Meeting to Review the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons and Its Supplementary Decisions. In co-operation with the Centre in Astana, the CPC also organized a seminar on the implementation of the OSCE Handbook of Best Practices on Conventional Ammunition, gathering experts from Central Asia and the South Caucasus. Finally, the CPC organized a side event and an exhibition in the margins of the Athens Ministerial Council Meeting that demonstrated practical assistance provided by the Forum on small arms and light weapons and stockpiles of conventional ammunition.

The CPC also continued to operate and maintain the OSCE Communications Network at a very high level of reliability, to facilitate the implementation of numerous politico-military commitments laid down in the Vienna Document 1999 but also in the Treaty on Open Skies, the Conventional Forces Europe (CFE) Treaty and the Dayton Peace Agreement.

In the past year, 51 participating States were technically connected to the Network. One participating State was continuously offline, but fully joined the Network in January 2010. Currently, there is only one participating State with armed forces that is not connected to the Network. The CPC continues to work with this country.

Three assistance projects were successfully completed. The comprehensive small arms and light weapons and conventional ammunition programme in Tajikistan was concluded, and the joint Cyprus-OSCE project resulted in the destruction of 324 man-portable air defence systems (MANPADS). In Albania, the OSCE eliminated some 30 tonnes of melange, a highly toxic liquid rocket fuel component.

The greatest undertaking was the launching of the disposal phase of the melange project in Ukraine. The CPC is responsible for the management of this project, which in its ongoing initial phase (so called Phase III-A) aims to eliminate over 3,000 tonnes of melange. The implementation of the project is running according to the schedule and a progress report on the first cycle has recently been provided to all participating States. As the preparation for the launch of the next phase is nearing its end, this next phase entitled phase III-B will eliminate another 3,000 tonnes. However, a lot remains to be done and in the subsequent phases of this project the OSCE aims to eliminate additional 10,000 tonnes of melange. I call on the participating States to provide financial support to this important project, which is in our common interest.

In addition, the organization is involved in two joint OSCE-UNDP projects in Montenegro and Belarus. In 2009, a financial agreement was negotiated that allows for the smooth transfer of funds between the organizations.

It has become apparent that the lack of funding is one of the most serious impediments in the implementation and launching of OSCE SALW and conventional ammunition projects. Therefore, in 2009, the CPC continued its fundraising efforts in order to ensure effective and efficient implementation of projects.

To conclude, Mr. Chairperson, I assure you that also in 2010 the CPC will continue – in accordance with its mandate – to provide all necessary support for the FSC and its chairmanships. We will monitor the implementation of existing commitments and possible new initiatives in the politico-military dimension of security. This includes project activities in close co-ordination with other international and regional organizations as well as the organization of seminars and training programmes. The CPC will also support and co-ordinate the OSCE field operations in their activities aimed at assisting individual participating States in the implementation of their FSC commitments.

Thank you for your attention.

REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE HEADS OF VERIFICATION CENTRES TO THE AIAM BY THE SENIOR FSC SUPPORT OFFICER

2 March 2010

It is my great pleasure to bring to your attention some of the conclusions of the third heads of verification centres meeting held on 14 December 2009. The event took place following the FSC Decision No. 4/09, which tasked the CPC to organize and chair the discussions. The CPC has also produced written report, which has been distributed with the reference number FSC.GAL/4/10, dated 20 January.

The purpose of the meeting was to share views and experiences on the practical implementation of the Vienna Document. Unlike in previous occasions, the meeting was held separately from the Annual Implementation Assessment meeting to enable a better preparation by the HoV for the following AIAM. Hence, I hope that the ideas presented in December by the heads of verification have matured and will be followed-up by the delegations also in this framework.

As the complete report is distributed and also available in DocIn, I will only highlight a couple of issues, which to great extent have been raised by the participating States already before. One such element is the problem of the inspection quota race, which was mentioned also by Ambassador Salber.

In the HoV discussion it was noted that many of the inspections are used to serve as evaluations since the evaluation quota is usually exhausted even earlier in the year. One delegation noted that inspections should only be conducted in case there is reason to presume that a military activity is taking place. On the other hand, some participating States stated, inspections were considered to constitute a significant confidence- and security- building tool and countries should not refrain from using this opportunity.

Regarding contacts under Chapter IV of the VD, three concrete proposals were made. One addressed the timing of the demonstration of new types of major weapon and equipment systems, one focused on the criteria for selecting an air base for a visit. The third one proposed a more even distribution of airbase visits during the five-year periods. This last proposal was presented by the CPC under reference number FSC.GAL/139/09 and we stand ready to continue discussions on this paper. A preliminary exchange of views on all these proposals was held in the HoV meeting, but so far there has been no follow-up in the FSC.

In addition, one proposal related to Chapter I was made to share information on both the military unit as a whole and its possible separately located elements.

Regarding compliance and verification activities in the previous year, the problem of non-reply to an inspection request was raised. It was noted that this non-compliance is a recurring theme and the participating States should develop ways to address these situations. One possibility could be action taken by the FSC Chair.

The timing of future HoV meetings was also discussed. Some delegations preferred organising the meeting in December to feed into the preparations for the next year. Others found the scheduling closer to AIAM better. Hopefully our discussions in the coming two days will bring also some clarity on which option is deemed better and the FSC can then in due time take a decision on the next HoV meeting.

Let me finally take the opportunity to thank the participants of the head of verification meeting for their active support and commitment shown during the meeting. I hope that some of the ideas will be furthered by participating States through food-for-thought papers and/or draft decisions on these subjects, which should be discussed in the appropriate working groups of the FSC.

I thank you for your attention.

REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS

WORKING SESSION 1

Tuesday, 2 March 2010

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions

- Vienna Document 1999:
 - Annual exchange of military information;
 - Defence planning;
 - Risk reduction;
 - Military activities:
 - (i) Prior notification of certain military activities;
 - (ii) Annual calendars;
 - (iii) Constraining provisions;
 - (iv) Observation of certain military activities.
-

Working session 1, first part, was co-ordinated by Colonel François Pilot, Senior Military Adviser to the Delegation of Luxembourg to the OSCE; the rapporteur was Major Carlos Aguado, Military Adviser to the Delegation of Spain to the OSCE. The co-ordinator had distributed in advance his food-for-thought paper (FSC.AIAM/3/10), which considered different questions that might be discussed at the session.

The co-ordinator opened the session by recalling the clear mandate assigned by the seventeenth meeting of the Ministerial Council in Athens, which in its decision No. 16/09 called on the FSC “to explore ways in which to strengthen the OSCE’s politico-military toolbox, with particular attention to strengthening current arms control and CSBM instruments, including strengthening the Vienna Document 1999”. That constituted an ambitious programme in connection with the Corfu Process.

1. Annual Exchange of Military Information (AEMI)

The co-ordinator mentioned the different trends that had been noted when assessing the last AEMIs: minimum information versus maximum transparency. He launched the debate by asking whether the substance of the current exchange of information met the requirements of the OSCE participating States.

Two delegations started the debate by giving general views on the mandate assigned by the Ministerial Council to the FSC and on the importance of maintaining relevant CSBMs. One of those delegations also stressed the importance of updating the VD 99 to take into account the evolving situation as a basis for the European security architecture and the

OSCE. In that regard, the same delegation supported the Danish and United Kingdom food-for-thought papers that had already been presented as a way to accomplish that aim.

One delegation, in its statement (FSC.AIAM/16/10), referred to its food-for-thought paper (FSC.DEL/196/09). That proposal reflected the fact that, in a number of cases, the headquarters of military formations or combat units were deployed in separated locations, including in the territories of different countries. That information was not reflected in the Annual Exchange of Military Information.

The co-ordinator expressed his agreement regarding the need to strengthen the VD 99, since it had not been really modified since 1994, given that the update of 1999 had entailed only minor changes. In order to continue the debate, he reflected on new doctrines entering into play and the development of new military equipment and capabilities (unmanned aerial vehicles, force multipliers) not covered by the VD 99, asking delegations if the exchange of information in its present form was still valid.

One delegation considered that the implementation of the AEMI was working but it did not provide a realistic picture of the current situation, in view of the qualitative development of military capabilities. The AEMI provided detailed information with relatively low military significance, for example on artillery units, while not covering very significant capabilities such as naval ones with much stronger fire-power. That delegation urged the rest of the delegations to consider the need for CSBMs in the naval area. Another suggestion presented was the need to unify the criteria when categorizing weapon systems, since participating States could interpret definitions freely. There was also a gap in certain types of units, such as multinational rapid reaction forces, that should also be included in the AEMI. Summing up, that delegation considered that the AEMI had been optimal during the 1990s, but it had not been updated to take into account the current situation; for that reason, there was a need to reconsider the substance of the exchange.

The co-ordinator introduced another subject of discussion in relation to the form of transmission of the AEMI. He raised the question as to whether hard copies were still needed.

One delegation supported the proposal to submit the exchange of information in electronic format only. That delegation also suggested the idea of a more modern system, a sort of database to which participating States could upload their information regularly. Thus, there would be a permanent exchange of information in electronic format via the data base, and no need for an annual exchange.

Two delegations indicated that the hard-copy exchanges of information needed to be kept instead of providing for only an electronic format, since that served as a way to double check potential discrepancies.

Another delegation recalled that the debate on hard copies had already taken place when the decision on electronic copies had been adopted, and at that time it had been agreed that the hard copy was needed.

2. Defence Planning

The co-ordinator acknowledged the complexity of fixing a single deadline for the exchange of information. Concerning the implementation of the exchange regarding Chapter

II of the VD 99 in 2009, it was pointed out that five participating States had not provided the information concerned during the last 5 year period, and explanations were requested.

None of the participating States in question responded. On the other hand, three delegations expressed their willingness to provide technical support or dedicated assistance to States requiring it. In that regard, one delegation recalled that the CPC also stood ready to provide technical assistance to participating States when needed.

One delegation asked the participants whether, apart from naval measures, there were any other proposals regarding information that was being omitted from the AEMI. No concrete proposals were brought forward.

There was no common understanding regarding one single deadline for the submission of the exchange of information on defence planning. One delegation indicated that, since there was no clear solution, it was necessary to remain vigilant in respect of that issue.

The co-ordinator and one delegation stressed the need to reflect in a paper (in a food-for-thought or draft decision format) all the suggestions by the AIAM, many of which had already been compiled by the CPC.

The last military doctrine seminar had taken place quite some time earlier, in 2006. The co-ordinator, supported by one participating State, proposed that a military doctrine seminar should again be organized in 2011. No objections were expressed.

3. Risk reduction

The co-ordinator pointed out that the risk-reduction mechanism had not been used in 2009. It had been used in 2008, with well known results. In order to facilitate the dialogue, the following question was raised:

Is the mechanism, as outlined in the VD 99, effective; is it inefficient and in need of change; or, if it fails, is that due to the lack of political will?

No delegations intervened.

4. Military activities

The co-ordinator introduced the topic by reporting the increase in voluntary notifications and the decrease in mandatory notifications prior to military exercises. The co-ordinator asked delegations whether the thresholds should be changed or the voluntary notification system continued.

Some delegations mentioned that they had voluntarily submitted prior notifications of major military activities carried out during 2009 below the thresholds specified in the VD 99, as reflected in the FSC Chairperson's statement (FSC, 461st meeting, 5 October 2005). Some of those delegations also took the opportunity to give a general description of the exercises concerned. One delegation also announced an exercise at tank-battalion level that would take place in 2010 and indicated the intention to invite observers.

One delegation reported on a multinational exercise carried out in 2009. The exercise had been below the thresholds specified, but the organizing participating States had sent a notification 42 days in advance and had invited several neighbouring countries, in keeping with the spirit of the VD 99. The same delegation emphasized that its authorities had reported their major exercises regularly, even when they had been below the threshold of notification, and regretted that many participating States did not do so.

There was a lively debate on the notification of military activities and observation. The discussion focused on the questions of voluntary notifications when exercises were below the thresholds or a reduction in the thresholds.

Two participating States proposed concrete points of reference when assessing a potential decrease in thresholds. The first one indicated that an analysis of the voluntary notifications submitted by participating States might be a good framework to look at. The second one suggested that the analysis of recent conflicts and the level of troops involved could be also a valid point of reference.

The co-ordinator suggested that the budgetary problem related not only to the reduction of exercises, but also to the cost of the invitations. In that case, a solution might be to limit the invitations to neighbouring participating States.

Some delegations supported the idea of decreasing the thresholds for notifications as a way of enhancing transparency. For those delegations, voluntary notifications were a temporary solution. Some of them indicated that, given that there was no consensus on decreasing the thresholds of notification, a formalization of voluntary notifications would be advisable.

Concerning the “formalization of voluntary notifications”, a possible way forward supported by some delegations might be to reinforce the FSC Chairperson’s statement (FSC, 461st meeting, 5 October 2005) on voluntary submission of prior notification of major military activities conducted below the thresholds of the VD 99 by making it an obligatory FSC decision. However, some delegations did not favour that suggestion, urging its voluntary nature.

One delegation answered the co-ordinator’s question, stating that its authorities had invited neighbouring countries in the Baltic area to exercises below the limits of notification during recent years. That delegation introduced an important issue in pointing out that the reduction of notification thresholds would increase the number of notifications, but also might produce relatively insignificant information, thereby augmenting the paper work. In that case, another delegation pointed out that caution should be exercised in weighing what was relevant and what was insignificant information. Several countries took the same view, referring to the need to avoid the proliferation of insignificant information.

Again, a lively debate arose on what could be considered significant information. Several delegations presented different points of view. Two delegations indicated that numbers of personnel or equipment could not be the most essential information; on the contrary, the introduction of new military capabilities or the so-called force multipliers might be what was really significant and useful in terms of transparency, confidence and predictability. Consequently, the information on military activities including that kind of systems should be deemed significant.

One delegation mentioned, along the same lines as previous delegations, that the reduction of thresholds would not always imply better results, since the information on battalion-size exercises, for instance, had no military significance. Even the largest exercise might not be militarily significant. Hence, it would be advisable to change the focus and also introduce different points of view. In any case, it was true that the information on the largest exercises always had a political value and was always significant to neighbouring countries.

One delegation indicated its pleasure at seeing that the strengthening of the VD 99 in response to Ministerial Council decision No. 16/09 was taking place in a very constructive manner. In that regard, the revision of Chapter V proposed by that delegation (FSC.DEL/13/10/Rev.1) would facilitate finding a solution to the problem of receiving a lot of insignificant information.

Two delegations introduced a different point of view, indicating that significant information was not always related to numbers, but also had a territorial component, since military activities, no matter their size, would always be significant to neighbouring countries. Therefore, the problem was not only to assess what was significant, but also to consider to whom the information might be significant.

One delegation reflected on new training procedures and considered that the level of command could be a good point of reference when addressing the reduction of thresholds.

Some delegations considered that the definition of “significant information” would be an interesting topic for further analysis and discussion by the FSC.

Calendars and constraining provisions

The co-ordinator described a discrepancy that was not always understood by participating States, since, according to the VD 99, information on annual calendars was to be provided for the next subsequent year, while information on constraining provisions should be provided on activities that a participating State planned to carry out or host in the second subsequent calendar year. Therefore there was no common understanding of paragraphs 68 and 69 of the VD 99.

5. Conclusions

The discussion was lively and constructive, and provided an opportunity for effective exchanges of opinions on a number of important issues. Some of them remain on the table and could be further discussed by the FSC in order to fulfil its mandate.

A total of 16 delegations contributed to the discussion during the first part of working session 1.

WORKING SESSION 1 (continued)

Tuesday, 2 March 2010

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions

- Vienna Document 1999:
 - Contacts;
 - Evaluation;
 - Inspection;
 - Regional measures;
 - Communications Network;
 - Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI).
-

Working session 1, second part, was co-ordinated by Dr. Loïc Simonet, Politico-Military Counsellor at the Permanent Mission of France to the OSCE; the rapporteur was Ms. Katarina Zakova, First Secretary at the Permanent Mission of the Slovak Republic to the OSCE. The co-ordinator opened the session, introducing his food-for-thought paper (distributed in advance under reference No. FSC.AIAM/5/10/Corr.1), which was designed to facilitate discussion on implementation of relevant chapters of the Vienna Document 1999 and GEMI. The paper suggested a number of possible issues for discussion and encouraged delegations to put forward ideas regarding possible ways of improving the implementation of the relevant provisions.

1. Contacts

The co-ordinator initiated the discussion by giving some statistical data concerning air-base visits and visits to military facilities and observation of certain military activities, comparing them to those for the previous year.

The discussion was opened by the reintroduction by one delegation of its food-for-thought paper¹ suggesting: (a) the organizing of a demonstration of a new type of major weapon and equipment system before all notifications on the implementation of the deployment had been completed, and (b) the possibility of organizing an air-base visit to a military air base operating combat helicopters in cases where the only normal peacetime air base operating combat aircraft had not been substantially upgraded, or a new type of combat aircraft had not been introduced since the visit in the previous five-year period. One

1 FSC.AIAM/7/10/Corr. 1 (1 March 2010).

delegation recalled that there were some participating States that also had only one military installation, and that should be taken into consideration, as well. It was proposed that the issue should be brought to the FSC's Working Group A for further discussion.

One participating State repeated its previous offer to use its Partnership-for-Peace Centre for conducting OSCE training.

Several delegations considered the obligatory 24-hour duration of an air-base visit to be artificial and recommended changing it to one working day lasting at least 12 hours, excluding the time required for travel of visitors. Other delegations considered the accompanying activities during the 24-hour visit to be important confidence- and trust-building measures and wanted to keep the current provision in its existing wording. The financial savings that could be achieved by means of the shortened visit were seen by one participating State as too small to be significant. On the other hand, the time needed for transport within the visited country might also play a role in the case of bigger countries.

Four participating States provided information about air-base visits in 2009; one participating State provided information about an air-base visit planned in 2011, and a visit to a military facility, as well as a demonstration of new types of major weapon and equipment systems; and one participating State spoke about an air-base visit planned in 2011.

2. Compliance and verification

The co-ordinator again initiated the discussion by providing relevant statistical data and raising thought-provoking questions.

The decreased number of inspections and evaluation visits in 2010 in comparison with the year 2009 was seen by some participating States as being a result of financial constraints experienced by some countries, but another participating State looked upon it as a possible reflection of an increase in mutual trust and confidence. The number of inspections and evaluation visits in 2009 had remained above the average level and thus did not seem to be too low.

Further to the 2009 initiatives, the size of inspection teams and the possible increase in quotas for inspection and evaluation visits were discussed. One delegation stated that evaluation-visit and inspection quotas were disproportionate to the size of the armed forces concerned, beyond any reasonable explanation. In addition, the financial burden of receiving an enlarged team was smaller than the present potential of multinational partnership.

Several delegations pointed out that new military equipment had changed the parameters for the level of military exercises, and their troops and equipment were now more often below the threshold; they recommended that that issue should also be taken into consideration. In that context, one delegation suggested: (a) a decrease in the thresholds for a notifiable military exercise; (b) a decrease in the thresholds for observation of a military exercise; and (c) new quotas for inspections and evaluation visits. The threshold for a mandatory notification of military activities would be lowered to 5,000 troops, or 80 tanks, or 120 ACVs, or 30 artillery pieces. Mandatory thresholds for observation of military activities would be based on current thresholds for troops, but taking into account the overall decrease in military equipment, applicable thresholds for equipment would be lowered to 150 tanks, or 200 ACVs, or 100 artillery pieces. New quotas for evaluation visits would derive from the

number of units – the passive quota would be two visits per 30 units and hosting of at least two evaluation visits by the same participating State in the same year. The passive quota for inspections would be increased to five per country and each State would be able to receive two inspections by the same country during one year².

A new proposal was put forward for establishing a system of reciprocity, whereby a country hosting an evaluation visit would automatically acquire the right to pay a reciprocity visit within one year after the received inspection. That arrangement would be over and above the standard quota system. Another delegation suggested raising the evaluation quotas per State uniformly to three, regardless of the size of a country or its armed forces. Another delegation recalled the initiative to redistribute the quota over the whole year so that the quota race could be prevented. Several delegations pointed out that inspections were often used instead of evaluation visits and thus not all quotas needed to be raised. They recommended that inspections be used for the purpose they had originally been designed for (to observe notifiable military activities or where another participating State believed a notifiable military activity was taking place), with the focus being on quotas for evaluation visits. Another participating State looked upon the use of inspections, also outside of their original purpose, as a valuable transparency and trust-building measure, even though a certain balance should be preserved and room left for the inspection of possible suspected activity. It was recalled that no unnotified military activity had thus far been discovered by any of the inspections conducted.

One delegation suggested that new quotas might be introduced on a voluntary bilateral basis. Another delegation suggested that additional quotas for inspections be placed at the disposal of the CiO and his/her team, which might exceed the current given number of inspectors. Some delegations suggested that extra quotas should be financed either by the requesting party or in end-of-year financial reconciliations. One participating State recalled its four extra quotas offered over the obligatory level. Some delegations did not see any need to raise any of the quotas; one delegation considered an increase in quotas as representing too big a burden, especially in respect of personnel strength of the verification unit, bearing in mind the possibility that the CFE regime would be revived.

One delegation questioned the soundness of conducting inspections in a country hosting military activities in which the inspecting participating State was a participant, thus exhausting quota and precluding another participating State from inspecting the exercise. Another delegation added that, even though such behaviour was not against the Vienna Document 1999, it did not complement transparency and confidence-building. In the discussion, it was further suggested that, in the co-ordination of evaluation visits, regional measures should also be borne in mind.

3. Regional measures

The co-ordinator recalled that bilateral agreements on additional confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) that had been signed supplemented the measures contained in the Vienna Document, and it appeared that those agreements were being implemented successfully.

2 FSC.AIAM/22/10 (4 March 2010).

During the discussion, two delegations provided information about their newly established mutual bilateral co-operation, already applied in 2009, and gave assurances of their interest in its continuation. Further prospects were being discussed. Another delegation provided information on its list of bilateral agreements and stated its openness to further co-operation.

4. Communications Network and GEMI issues

The Communications Network and GEMI issues were left aside owing to lack of time. The co-ordinator invited the delegations to circulate any contributions they might want to make on those issues in writing.

5. Conclusion

The discussion was lively, constructive, and much more engaged and with wider participation than in previous years. It provided an opportunity for effective exchanges of opinions on a number of important issues and proposals. Some of them were also suggested for continued discussion in the working groups of the FSC and the ongoing Corfu Process.

WORKING SESSION 2

Wednesday, 3 March 2010

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: Clarification, assessment and conclusions

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

The co-ordinator for the session was Colonel Steve Hartnell of the UK delegation and the rapporteur was Colonel Anders Byrén, of the Swedish delegation.

The co-ordinator opened the session by drawing participating States' attention to the food-for-thought paper that had been circulated (FSC.AIAM/4/10, dated 25 February 2010) and the potential areas for discussion. He noted that this session covered a wide range of implementation issues and urged participating States to make concrete proposals for their improvement.

One participating State stressed the importance of the OSCE document on principles governing conventional arms transfers, but stated that the implementation could be enhanced and that the principles were not applied in full. Work could be done in that field.

Concerning the principles governing non-proliferation, the co-ordinator raised the issue from the Athens Ministerial Declaration if there was a need to update the document. One participating State expressed that updating the document should be done, a view that was supported by a number of participating States. The conclusions from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference could be taken into account. One participating

State suggested that the scope of the document on non-proliferation should be widened to include conventional weapons.

One other participating State indicated a preference for focusing on practical implementation, while yet another participating State expressed the view that non-proliferation should not be a priority, since the Organization and delegations did not have the necessary capacity or expertise relating to the issue. A concrete proposal was put forward for the establishment of a “Group of Friends of UNSCR 1540” to explore future actions, which was supported by some other participating States.

One participating State commented that the document on stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations represented a serious achievement, as it comprised a wide range of reasonable measures and embodied the flexibility required for use in crisis response by parties to a conflict.

The was no discussion on the questionnaire on anti-personnel landmines.

On the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, the proposal for a reference guide to assist participating States in completing the new questionnaire that had been circulated was discussed. The next step should be that of receiving comments and experience from the current year’s information exchange in order to finalize the reference guide. A number of participating States noted that the proposal to draft a reference guide was useful. One participating State was of the opinion that a comprehensive questionnaire would not help if some participating States chose to provide inaccurate information.

The FSC Chair’s Co-ordinator of the Code of Conduct mentioned that the “third cluster” on supplementary measures still remained to be worked on. He informed delegations on a proposal for a separate implementation assessment meeting on the Code of Conduct and asked to consider distribution of additional proposals within this cluster.

With regard to the assessment of the implementation of the provisions of the Code of Conduct, there was discussion as to whether the Code of Conduct should be the subject of detailed discussion in AIAM or whether a special meeting should rather be convened looking at the responses provided by participating States in the context of the annual information exchange. One participating State expressed its intent to re-submit a proposal from 2007 on improving the regular assessment of the implementation of the Code of Conduct.

One participating State recalled the importance of the Code, both in intra-State issues such as the democratic control of armed forces, and in inter-State relations, of which there was a tendency to overlook the latter.

One participating State said that it was giving consideration to hosting a regional Code of Conduct seminar in the current year to support the implementation of FSC Decision No. 1/08, on awareness raising and outreach of the Code of Conduct.

On the Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons, the FSC Chairperson informed the meeting that a food-for-thought paper on a plan of action on SALW would soon be issued as a draft decision aiming at approval by the FSC by May 2010, in accordance with Ministerial Council Decision No. 15/09 on small arms and light weapons and stockpiles of conventional ammunition. One participating State expressed the view that consideration of

the matter was opportune, considering the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, which was to take place in June. Another participating State expressed its willingness to support including brokering control in the plan of action, in accordance with the report of the group of governmental experts, which had been issued as UN General Assembly document A/62/163, and to promote implementation of the International Tracing Instrument (ITI). On the other hand, for the time being, it would not want to include marking of ammunition, adopt the International Small Arms Control Standards, nor agree on standardized normative criteria for the transfer of SALW.

Concerning the Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (SCA), the co-ordinator noted that practical assistance with SCA issues was the most active area of concrete OSCE projects. One participating State put forward a proposal calling for destruction to be considered as the preferred method of disposing of surplus and obsolete conventional ammunition. The proposal was expected to be further discussed in the FSC and its Working Group A.

There was no discussion on the principles for export controls of MANPADS.

On the issue of the control of brokering in SALW, the co-ordinator referred to Ministerial Council Decision No. 15/09 and raised the issue how to take concrete steps to implement the ITI. One participating State said that it found outreach to be an important way to strengthen the implementation of the ITI. Another participating State recalled that the ITI and brokering control were included in the plan of action and hoped it would encourage participating States to further discuss the issue.

On the subject of standard elements on end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports, the co-ordinator drew participating States' attention to the critical issue of diversion and the end-user certificates and how to verify the procedures. One participating State noted that there had been little progress this issue since the 19th AIAM and the issue of standard elements of end-user certificates could be further explored and ideas from the previous AIAM and the Third Biennial Meeting could be considered. If there was analysis of verification procedures then this may provide sufficient information to consider the production of supplementary guidance for the Handbook of Best practices for SALW.

WORKING SESSION 3

Wednesday, 3 March 2010

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

Suggestions aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs

Working session 3 was moderated by Dr. Pierre von Arx, Diplomatic Counsellor of the Swiss Delegation to the OSCE; the rapporteur was Ms. Stéphanie Rossion, First Secretary to the Permanent Representation of Belgium to the OSCE. The moderator had distributed in advance his food-for-thought paper (FSC.AIAM/2/10), which was designed to stimulate and encourage discussions on the improvement of the implementation of confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs).

1. Introduction by the moderator

The moderator opened the session by recalling the short history of the working session dealing with the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs, included for the first time in 2007. The first two years, there were almost no discussions, whereas 2009 showed some improvement. He hoped for even more active discussions in 2010.

He mentioned the purpose of the AIAM, which was not only to provide input from the capitals to Vienna, but also to raise awareness in the capitals. He reminded the participants that CSBMs were once again high on the political agenda, as the Ministerial Council decision on issues relevant to the Forum for Security Co-operation (MC.DEC/16/09) had called on the FSC to “explore ways in which to strengthen the OSCE’s politico-military toolbox, with particular attention to strengthening current arms control and CSBM instruments, including strengthening the Vienna Document 1999” (hereafter “VD 99”). He also noted that the debates of the working session could potentially contribute to the Corfu Process, aiming at restoring trust, confidence and transparency among participating States.

The following is a thematic account of the discussions.

2. Improvement of implementation of the VD 99

The moderator launched the debate by asking whether the third Heads of Verification Centres (HoV) meeting held in Vienna on 14 December 2009 had helped to improve the implementation of the VD 99.

All the delegations taking the floor on the subject expressed their appreciation for the HoV meeting and the need to maintain it. One delegation indicated that it would prefer the HoV meeting to be held back to back with the AIAM, so as to save travel time and to improve both meetings. A few delegations expressed their flexibility regarding timing. However, several delegations supported keeping the HoV meeting in December so as to leave time to develop ideas for the AIAM. One delegation indicated that costs were already saved by coupling the HoV meeting with the annual exchange of military information (AEMI).

The moderator launched the idea of changing the yearly schedule of the Vienna Document by starting the implementation in April. That would permit full use to be made of the AIAM as an annual review meeting, allowing discussions of the implementation schedule for the coming year, and could temper the quota race during the new-year period.

One delegation considered that it was time to agree on a definition of *force majeure*, which had emerged as a de facto area of confusion, and gave some indications as to its own understanding of the concept by giving concrete proposals, nevertheless being open to other considerations. That delegation recalled the existing food-for-thought paper on the issue. Two other delegations expressed their interest in moving forward on the topic.

One delegation referred to another delegation's proposal relating to the use of digital cameras during verification activities and suggested that specific procedures and limitations should be developed for the use of new technologies. The issue was the same as with analogue cameras, but the adoption of a decision on digital cameras would afford an occasion for including such procedures. Many delegations stressed that digital cameras have become a "fact of life" and that, as we were now well into the twenty-first century, it was high time to close the issue. Another delegation stated that, if no agreement was reached on the technical issue of digital cameras, that would already constitute a bad signal as to the possibility of further improving the VD 99 in line with the evolving security situation.

One delegation raised the issue of a participating State carrying out an inspection when it was already participating in a military exercise, thereby exhausting the inspection quota without increasing transparency. It proposed to solve this concern either by not counting the inspection towards the quota or by creating additional quota for this purpose.

Several delegations insisted on the need to maintain the *acquis* of CSBMs and to fully implement existing CSBMs. One delegation suggested that the FSC Chairperson should be entitled to contact the participating State in breach of implementation and request explanation of possible obstacles causing non-compliance or non-implementation of commitments. The FSC Chairperson could subsequently initiate a discussion on that matter, present the response to the plenary and propose a possible way forward.

3. Evolution of the environment and of the armed forces

Regarding the evolution of armed forces and military technology, one delegation indicated that the real challenge for the FSC was to assess the qualitative changes in the armed forces, such as the immaterial capacity of experts in network warfare. Another delegation stressed that both the evolving security environment and military developments had to be taken into account in the process of modernization.

There was a general agreement that a military doctrine seminar could help participating States to understand, and could provide the impetus to deal with, the evolving security situation and the evolution of the armed forces. Such a seminar would also support a broader debate on further CSBMs and afford an opportunity to conduct an assessment of current and emerging military threats. One delegation indicated that this would provide an opportunity to discuss the use of force outside of the national territory.

One delegation referred to its own proposal for an information exchange on naval forces. Two other delegations rejected the topic of naval CSBMs, referring *inter alia* to maritime rights, which do not bar naval activities on the high seas from observation.

One delegation announced that it was looking for new approaches to Chapter III of the VD 99, on “Risk reduction”, even though it did not as yet have any precise ideas. The same delegation considered that Chapter V, on “Prior notification of certain military activities”, should be adapted so as to render the voluntary notification of the largest military activity compulsory, in addition to possibly lowering thresholds.

4. CSBMs and conflict prevention and management

The moderator recalled that the Corfu Process was currently studying the possibility of establishing a comprehensive and systematic OSCE-wide early warning capacity, completing the existing arms control agreements and CSBMs. He asked which CSBMs were required to enhance trust and confidence in the current geo-strategic environment, benefiting each participating State, thus enhancing the quality of our co-operative security.

The first delegation to react to the topic indicated that there was no universal solution for conflicts, since each conflict had its own characteristics. However, CSBMs could have a de-escalation effect. That delegation expressed the opinion that an increase in the number of monitors could have prevented tension, and potentially the 2008 conflict. However, there was a lack of political will on the part of one participating State, as well as a lack of conflict-prevention mechanisms that could have been activated without consensus. Interesting proposals were now brought forward in the framework of the Corfu Process. Those should address the problem of black holes in the OSCE area and ensure international presence.

Another delegation stated that the previous delegation seemed to indicate that the conflict was caused by a lack of monitoring, whereas it was caused by a breach of the negotiation mechanisms and a decision to use military force. In its view, black holes could be avoided by involving the two States concerned in the VD 99.

The moderator agreed that the presence of OSCE monitors was in itself a CSBM. He pointed out that there was now a political will to discuss the issue in all its aspects in order to enhance common security. In order to respond more adequately to crisis situations, he suggested the introduction of challenge inspections – for example as a new VD 99 chapter – where each participating State would pre-agree to the allocation of a quota for challenge inspections, to be conducted without preconditions by an international inspection team in a crisis situation; such a pragmatic CSBM would be a mechanism for early warning.

One delegation indicated that it was difficult to create CSBMs between parties to a conflict, as there was no trust between them, and that CSBMs should be critically reviewed with regard to their applicability to conflict or crisis situations. Its position in the specific context of black holes or unrecognized regions was that the best confidence-building consisted in progress in the negotiation process and withdrawal of armed forces from the occupied territories.

5. Methodology for strengthening the VD 99

Many delegations were eager to discuss the methodology for strengthening the VD 99. One delegation indicated that a real consensus had emerged to adapt the CSBM regimes to new realities and that it was quite an achievement, as part of the Corfu Process.

The moderator recalled that the broad current political discussion under the Corfu Process had already settled important guiding principles: (1) the need to maintain the *acquis* of CSBMs; (2) the need to fully implement existing CSBMs; (3) the need to improve the current arms control regimes and CSBMs; and (4) the need to base further developments on the existing CSBMs.

One delegation drew a distinction between the improvement of the VD 99 as it stands today and additional issues brought up that could be discussed separately and either be included in the VD 99 or remain as stand-alone decisions. That delegation wished to focus on the VD itself, based on its shortcomings. It was supported by at least one other delegation, which wished to proceed on the basis of the current VD.

Several delegations expressed their support for the food-for-thought papers “Vienna Document 1999 – A way forward” (FSC.DEL/13/10/Rev.1) and “On Establishing a Procedure for Incorporating Relevant FSC Decisions into the Vienna Document” (FSC.DEL/9/10/Rev.1). One of the delegations said that agreement on those papers would get the process under way. Another delegation stated that it still needed to thoroughly analyse the papers, but was afraid that packages might result in unhelpful linkages and stalemates. It would rather look at the document as a whole.

One delegation suggested that the very first step in strengthening the VD 99 should be the adoption of the seven FSC Chairperson’s statements delivered since 1999. That idea was supported by other delegations, two of which also encouraged delegations to put forward food-for-thought papers with attached draft decisions. One of those two delegations also stated that the process of adopting the FSC Chairperson’s statements should last only a few weeks and should not prevent a more ambitious approach.

The discussion demonstrated a general receptiveness and readiness to work on the existing proposals. Some delegations noted that, although they might not be the best way forward, they seemed to be the only way forward.

One delegation underlined the need to engage in informal consultations on the topic. That delegation expressed its willingness to achieve a first revision of the VD 99 in 2010. Another delegation stated that consultations tended to be selective and that the dialogue needed to be inclusive. The first delegation responded that it always aimed for the most democratic form of discussion or decision-making, whether with the CFE regime or the VD 99. Consultations would not be closed, but only of a smaller format, which might prove to be more efficient, without necessarily alienating any delegation from the decision process.

One delegation requested clarification from the FSC Chairperson regarding the tasking assigned by Ministerial Council Decision No. 16/09 and the process for fulfilling it. It was not quite sure there was a common understanding of words such as “review”, “develop” and “assess”. The FSC Chairperson pointed out that the triple use of the word “strengthen” in

the decision was not due to a lack of vocabulary but a deliberate choice, and that the two food-for-thought papers mentioned above initiated the work on developing a procedure.

6. Conclusion

One delegation expressed its appreciation for the inspired discussion and underlined that it was the first time that the session ran out of time. It was happy that the situation had changed since 2004–2005, when the word “review” was a taboo.

The discussions showed the need to maintain the *acquis* of CSBMs and to fully implement the existing CSBMs. At the same time, there was a common agreement on the need to improve the VD 99, as well as its implementation. The participating States showed their readiness to work on the existing proposals. Furthermore, fully implemented CSBMs confirmed their usefulness in conflict prevention and conflict resolution.

The need to have a broader debate on further CSBMs, taking into account the modernization of the armed forces, was also recognized by several participating States. A military doctrine seminar would provide a platform to deal with the evolving security situation and the evolution of the armed forces.

The session was characterized by a very active participation by participating States in the debate and seemed too short to deal thoroughly with all the topics proposed by the moderator in his food-for-thought paper. During the session, 29 interventions were made by a total of 19 different delegations.

CLOSING SESSION

**REMARKS BY
THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REPUBLIC OF
CROATIA TO THE OSCE IN HIS CAPACITY AS THE CHAIRPERSON
OF THE CLOSING SESSION OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL
IMPLEMENTATION ASSESMENT MEETING**

Vienna, 3 March 2010

Distinguished delegates,
Dear colleagues,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is my great pleasure to open the closing session of the 2010 Annual Implementation Meeting (AIAM). Following the agenda, as indicated in the document FSC.AIAM/1/10, I would like to make a brief summary of the Meeting.

Since Croatia, having the chairmanship of the closing session, has an obligation – together with the rapporteurs of the working sessions – to report on the Meeting to the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC), I shall focus on the brief abstracts that the co-ordinators and rapporteurs have provided me for this occasion.

Before that, let me call special attention to the valuable contributions during the opening session by chairperson of the opening and working sessions, Cyprus; by the Chairperson of the FSC, Greece; by the Director of the CPC; as well as by the CPC representative. Their thought-provoking remarks and presentations initiated fruitful discussions during the working sessions.

Working session 1 took place in the morning of 2 March 2010, on the topic: Implementation of the VD 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions

Co-ordinator: Mr. Francois Pilot

Rapporteur: Mr. Carlos Aguado Valladares

Annual exchange of military information

The co-ordinator launched the debate by asking if the substance of the current exchange of information met the requirements of the participating States.

One delegation proposed that the information should be made consistent with the situation of the main unit on the ground and the geographical location of its subunits. There was a lively debate on the substance of the exchange, but no concrete proposals were put forward, except that the need for CSBMs in the naval area and for rapid reaction forces should be considered. Those proposals have already been on the table for a couple of years, but have never been agreed upon.

There was no agreement on the proposal to replace the hard-copy exchange by an electronic exchange.

Defence planning

With reference to defence planning in 2009, it was pointed out that five participating States had not provided the information concerned in the past five years. Two delegations stated their willingness to provide technical assistance to States requiring it, while another delegation indicated that the CPC also stood ready to extend support.

There was no common understanding on one single deadline for the submission of the exchange of information on defence planning.

The proposal of the co-ordinator that a military doctrine seminar should be organized in 2011 was supported by one participating State. There was no objection from the floor.

Risk reduction

There was no intervention concerning Chapter III, Risk Reduction.

Military activities and observation

There was a lively debate on the notification of military activities and observation. Voluntary notifications below thresholds or the possibility of reducing the thresholds were central to the discussion. Most of the interventions recalled the UK proposal regarding the issue and suggested that it should be discussed further in Working Group A.

Calendars and constraining provisions

The co-ordinator brought to the attention of the Meeting that information on annual calendars was to be provided for the next subsequent year, while information on constraining provisions should be provided in the second subsequent calendar year.

Working session 1, second part, took place in the afternoon of 2 March 2010, on the topic: Implementation of the VD 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI: Clarification, assessment and conclusions

Co-ordinator: Mr. Loic Simonet

Rapporteur: Ms. Katarina Žakova

A lively discussion took place during the second part of working session 1. A relatively large number of new proposals were presented and both the Corfu Process and the FSC working groups were recommended as appropriate venues for further deliberation on the issue.

Contacts

Under the subtitle contacts, a food-for-thought paper that had been presented on practical aspects of organizing the Vienna Document 1999, Chapter IV: Contacts, was discussed. It is expected that the discussion will continue in an FSC working group.

The usefulness of the obligatory 24-hour duration of an air-base visit was scrutinized and views supporting both its preservation and its shortening were presented.

Compliance and verification

Even though the year 2009 witnessed a decrease in inspections and evaluation visits, their number remains above the average levels of the last five years. Participating States generally agreed that their use could be improved. To achieve that, several proposals were put forward concerning the possible review of passive quotas for inspections and evaluation visits. The proposals varied from advocating uniformly equal numbers for all participating States to recommending the fixing of specific criteria for their calculation based on the size of armed forces, or a reciprocal approach, or an additional quota for the CiO. Both obligatory and voluntary increases in quotas were proposed. Different approaches to defraying the costs of inspections were proposed.

Several delegations stressed that conventional armed forces had changed their parameters, and that influenced the level of military exercises. Troops and equipment used during military exercises were thus now more often below the current threshold. In response to that observation, one participating State proposed specific decreased thresholds for a notifiable military exercise and for observation of such an exercise.

Regional measures

Three countries informed the participating States about their good practices in regional bilateral co-operation aimed at supporting that important regional CSBM instrument.

Conclusion

Unfortunately, the discussion did not allow the participating States the scope to elaborate on the remaining topics on the agenda, namely, Communications Network and GEMI. The interest of the participating States in dealing seriously with Ministerial Council Decision No. 16/09, mandating the participating States to explore ways in which to strengthen the OSCE's politico-military toolbox, was confirmed, with particular attention to current arms control and CSBM instruments, including strengthening of the Vienna Document 1999. None of the proposals garnered clear support; nevertheless, some were met with a positive initial reaction.

Working session 2: Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: Clarification, assessment and conclusions

Co-ordinator: Mr. Steve Hartnell

Rapporteur: Mr. Anders Byren

The discussions were most active concerning the document on Principles Governing Non-Proliferation and the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security.

Concerning the Principles Governing Non-Proliferation, one participating State raised the issue of the need to update the document, and that view was supported by some participating States. One other participating State stated a preference for focusing on practical implementation, while yet another participating State said that non-proliferation should not be a focus area, since the Organization and delegations did not have the necessary expertise on the issue. A concrete proposal was put forward for the establishment of a “Group of Friends of UNSCR 1540” to explore future actions.

On the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, the discussion focused mainly on the proposal for a reference guide to support participating States in filling in the new Questionnaire, as well as on whether the Code of Conduct should be discussed in the AIAM or whether a special meeting should rather be convened to review its implementation by participating States by looking at the answers they had provided in the annual information exchange. A third area discussed was the importance of the Code regarding both such intra-State issues as the democratic control of armed forces, and inter-State relations, which tended to be forgotten.

The FSC Chairperson informed the Meeting that a food-for-thought paper embodying a plan of action on SALW would soon be issued as a draft decision, and a decision needed to be adopted by May 2010, in accordance with MC Decision No. 15/09.

One participating State put forward a proposal according to which destruction should be the preferred method of disposal for conventional ammunition.

Working session 3: Suggestions aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs

Co-ordinator: Mr. Pierre von Arx

Rapporteur: Ms. Stephanie Rossion

The third working session also saw a very active participation by delegations in the debate. The need to maintain the *acquis* of CSBMs and to fully implement existing CSBMs was expressed.

There also seemed to be agreement on the need to improve the VD 99, as well as its implementation, by focusing on the existing document as it stood. A readiness to work on the existing proposals was also expressed.

A broader debate needed to take place on further CSBMs, taking into account the modernization of armed forces.

Several participating States stated that CSBMs could be useful in conflict prevention and conflict resolution. There was a need to continue the meetings of heads of verification centres. The timing needed to be discussed further.

A military doctrine seminar could give impetus to action to deal with the evolving security situation and the evolution of armed forces.

Agenda and modalities of the 2011 AIAM

In the light of the previous meetings, I would like to suggest that the agenda and dates for the 2011 AIAM be decided by the Forum for Security Co-operation in the near future.

Concluding remarks

In conclusion, I would like to note that the review and discussion of the implementation of the Vienna Document 1999, as well as of the confidence- and security-building measures, and the consideration of all suggestions must remain a priority for the FSC.

Acknowledgment

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to all the co-ordinators and rapporteurs for this Meeting. Their excellent work helped all the chairpersons in preparing and running the 2010 AIAM. I also wish to thank all the delegations and Partners for Co-operation for their fruitful and interactive dialogue over the past two days. Finally, I would like to thank the FSC Chairmanship, Greece; and Cyprus, which chaired the opening and working sessions; the CPC; the FSC Support Unit; the Conference Services and the interpreters for their excellent work.

I now declare the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting closed.

Thank you.

**REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF
THE CLOSING SESSION**

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

Vienna, 2 and 3 March 2010

Madam Chairperson,

Croatia in its capacity of the chairmanship of the closing session of the twentieth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) held in Vienna on 2 and 3 March 2010, has the honour to report to the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) on the main 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 (VD 99). In open and constructive discussions, the experts and officials who attended the AIAM exchanged experiences, made suggestions, and gave their assessments of the implementation of OSCE commitments in this area.

FSC Decision No. 10/09 set the agenda and modalities of the Meeting which consisted of three working sessions. The opening and working sessions were chaired by Cyprus, while Croatia chaired the closing session. The discussions in each working session were moderated by a co-ordinator and summarized by a rapporteur.

1. Opening session

Cyprus, as chairmanship of the opening session, stressed (FSC.AIAM/6/10) the importance of the AIAM as an opportunity for participating States to productively discuss and assess the implementation of VD 99, other agreed CSBMs and FSC decisions. Cyprus emphasized that the FSC began working immediately, in the aftermath of the successful Athens Ministerial meeting, so as to prepare ideas and suggestions aiming at improving the OSCE politico-military core document, the VD 99. According to Chairmanship of the opening session, the Corfu Process and Athens decisions have become a milestone for future steps. The Chairmanship made a brief introduction to its perspective of the Meeting and encouraged delegations to raise their concerns, offer constructive suggestions, note positive achievements and generate new ideas for strengthening the VD 99 and other CSBM documents as well as for their implementation.

Greece, as the current Chairmanship of the FSC, gave a statement (FSC.AIAM/15/10) reminding on the role and objectives of the AIAM, saying that beyond its original mandate, the AIAM subsequently expanded and became the major event to review implementation of the politico-military commitments and charts the way forward. With the aim of taking the work forward, the FSC Chairmanship reminded delegations of the Ministerial Council decision on issues relevant to the FSC and emphasized the value of the food-for-thought papers currently under discussion in the FSC as well as food-for-thought papers prepared by co-ordinators. Greece also reiterated its conviction of the importance of implementation of already agreed commitments. It reminded the participating States, which have not exchanged their annual information data and have not provided explanation, that they are, according to

paragraph 150.4 of the VD 99, “expected to explain the reasons and provide an expected date for their compliance with this commitment, during the AIAM.”

The Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) (FSC.AIAM/8/10) referred to the summary report on trends and main CPC activities in support of the FSC’s work during 2009. In reviewing the summary report distributed as FSC.GAL/19/10 on 12 February 2010, he pointed to some trends that can be detected from the report in terms of verification measures under Chapter IX of the VD 99, as well as on the exchanges of military information in 2009.

According to the presentation of the CPC Summary Report, the overall implementation level has remained “relatively stable and high” during the past year, which has also been considered as another active year in terms of verification measures.

Speaking about the undertakings of the CPC in 2009, the Director reminded of the maintaining the records of the implementation of CSBMs, organizing meetings, workshops and seminars, and operating and maintaining the OSCE Communications Network.

In terms of the assistance projects the launching of the disposal phase of the melange project in Ukraine has been emphasized this year again.

The CPC Director concluded by saying that his Centre would continue, in accordance with its mandate, to provide the required support for the FSC and its chairmanships in their efforts to further assist OSCE participating States in the implementation of their FSC commitments.

The CPC also reported to the AIAM (FSC.AIAM/9/10) on the third meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres, held on 14 December 2009. As the complete report (FSC.GAL/4/10) of the Heads of Verification Centres has been distributed earlier and is available in DocIn, a representative of the CPC highlighted only a couple of issues of particular interest of the participating States expressed before.

Several delegations distributed their statements during the opening session.

2. Working sessions

Working session 1 was co-ordinated by Mr. Francois Pilot, Military Adviser of the Permanent Representation of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg. The rapporteur was Mr. Carlos Aguado Valladares, Military Adviser to the Permanent Mission of Spain. Working session 1 (continued) was co-ordinated by Mr. Loïc Simonet, Politico-military Counsellor to the Permanent Mission of France. The rapporteur was Ms. Katarína Žáková, First Secretary to the Permanent Mission of Slovakia.

Working session 2 was co-ordinated by Mr. Steve Hartnell, Senior Military Adviser to the UK Permanent Mission. The rapporteur was Mr. Anders Byren, Military Adviser to the Delegation of Sweden.

Working session 3 was co-ordinated by Mr. Pierre von Arx, Diplomatic Counsellor of the Swiss Delegation. The rapporteur was Ms. Stephanie Rossion, First Secretary to the Permanent Representation of Belgium.

The co-ordinators of the working sessions had circulated introductory, food-for-thought-papers in advance of the AIAM aimed at stimulating and encouraging discussions on topics covered in the various sessions.

Detailed and comprehensive information about the debates in each session can be found in the reports of the respective working session rapporteurs (FSC.AIAM/23/10; FSC.AIAM/24/10; FSC.AIAM/25/10 and FSC.AIAM/26/10), which have been officially distributed as of today (10 March 2010) and will be incorporated in the consolidated summary of the AIAM.

3. Closing session

At the closing session Croatia in its capacity of chairmanship delivered brief summary report, in which the summary reports on the proceedings and results of the working sessions made by four rapporteurs have been incorporated. No disagreements were expressed with the substance of the summary report presented by Croatia.

There was no discussion under the item “general discussion”.

It was agreed that the agenda and dates for the 2011 AIAM will be decided by the Forum for Security Co-operation in the near future.

The Chairmanship of the closing session noted that the review of implementation of confidence-and-security-building measures was an important annual event, and the implementation of those measures remains a priority for the FSC.

In closing, the chairmanship expressed its appreciation to all OSCE delegations and to the OSCE Partners for Co-operation for participating in the Meeting. The chairmanship also thanked Greece, as current FSC Chairmanship, and Cyprus, as chairmanship of the opening and working AIAM sessions, as well as the co-ordinators and rapporteurs of the working sessions, the experts who came from capitals, the representatives from the CPC, and the OSCE’s interpreters and Conference Services for their invaluable support and contributions that helped make this year’s AIAM a success.

Madam Chairperson, this concludes my brief abstract of the twentieth AIAM session. More detailed information can be found in the documents referred to in this report, as well as in the other documents distributed in the course of the Meeting.

Thank you.