



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Economic Forum (Senior Council)**

EF.GAL/11/00

8 May 2000

ENGLISH only

Conference Services

EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM

Prague, 11-14 April 2000

SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PLACE, DATE AND OVERALL THEME FOR THE ECONOMIC FORUM IN THE YEAR 2000 (Permanent Council Decision No. 308 (PC.DEC/308))	1
THE MAIN SUBJECTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES FOR THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM (Permanent Council Decision No. 340 (PC.DEC/340))	2
AGENDA AND WORK PROGRAMME OF THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM	4
DRAFT FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF WORKING GROUPS – “ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION: THE CHALLENGES OF TRANSFORMATION”	7
DRAFT WORKING AGENDA FOR THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM 2000 – “ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION: THE CHALLENGES OF TRANSFORMATION”	12
CHAIRMAN’S SUMMARY OF THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM	16
REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR ON THE REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS IN THE ECONOMIC DIMENSION	22
REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUP RAPPORTEURS	
Working Group I: Economic rehabilitation and the next steps in the transition: institution-building, rule of law and the role of civil society	24
Working Group II: Environmental impact of conflicts and rehabilitation measures	28
Working Group III: Experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts	32
Special session on challenges of transformation: A framework for economic recovery	37
Special session on rule of law, good governance and the need to combat corruption	39
Annex 1: List of Participants	41
Annex 2: Log of contributions	60

237th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 237, Agenda item 5

**DECISION No. 308
PLACE, DATE AND OVERALL THEME FOR THE
ECONOMIC FORUM IN THE YEAR 2000**

The Permanent Council,

Taking into account the Chairman's Summary of the Seventh Meeting of the Economic Forum,

- Decides that the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum will take place in Prague from 11 to 14 April 2000. The overall theme of the Forum will be "Economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation: the challenges of transformation".

Discussions of the Forum should benefit from input provided by deliberations in various international organizations, other OSCE bodies and relevant meetings, including seminars.

Moreover, taking into account its mandate, the Economic Forum will review the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension.

The organizational modalities, including the sub-themes of the Forum, will be further elaborated and submitted to the Permanent Council for adoption before the end of 1999.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/340
10 February 2000

Original: ENGLISH

269th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 269, Agenda item 7

**DECISION No. 340
THE MAIN SUBJECTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES
FOR THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM
11-14 APRIL 2000**

Pursuant to Chapter VII, paragraphs (21) to (32), of the Helsinki Document 1992, and

Recalling its Decision No. 308 of 1 July 1999,

The Permanent Council decides that,

1. Within the framework of the overall theme “Economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation: the challenges of transformation” and with regard to the three preparatory seminars, that were held in the course of 1999 and 2000, the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum will concentrate on the following main subjects:
 - (a) Economic rehabilitation and the next steps in the transition: institution-building, rule of law and the role of civil society
 - (b) Environmental impact of conflicts; rehabilitation measures
 - (c) Experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts.
2. Moreover, taking into account its mandate, the Economic Forum will
 - (a) Review the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension and the recommendations of the Seventh Economic Forum, including the seminars held under the economic dimension since the last Economic Forum.
 - (b) Discuss future activities for the economic dimension in 2000/2001.
3. The participating States are encouraged to be represented at a high level by officials responsible for shaping international economic policy in the OSCE area. Participation of representatives from the private sector in their delegations would be welcome.
4. As in previous years, the format of the Economic Forum should foresee the active involvement of relevant international organizations and encourage open discussions.

5. The following international organizations are invited to participate in the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum: Council of Europe, Energy Charter Secretariat, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Environment Agency, European Investment Bank, International Atomic Energy Agency, International Labour Organization, International Monetary Fund, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, World Health Organization and other relevant organizations.
6. The Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia) and the Partners for Co-operation (Japan and the Republic of Korea) are invited to participate in the Economic Forum.
7. Upon request by a delegation of an OSCE participating State, regional groupings may also be invited, as appropriate, to participate in the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum.
8. Subject to the provisions contained in Chapter IV, paragraphs (15) and (16), of the Helsinki Document 1992, the representatives of non-governmental organizations, having relevant experience in the area under discussion are free after registering with the OSCE Secretariat to participate in the meeting.
9. The Chair of the Forum will present his/her summary conclusions from the discussions at the end of the meeting.

AGENDA AND WORK PROGRAMME
OF THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM

(Prague, 11-14 April 2000)

1. Opening of the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum
 - (a) Welcoming remarks by a representative of the host Government
 - (b) Opening address by the representative of the Chairperson-in-Office
 - (c) Welcoming remarks by the Secretary General of the OSCE
 - (d) Presentation of the activity report of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
2. Review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension
 - General overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic dimension
3. Economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation: the challenges of transformation
 - (a) Keynote address
 - (b) Roles and challenges for the OSCE
4. General debate
5. Discussion by the Working Groups and Special Sessions:
 - (a) WG I: Economic rehabilitation and the next steps in the transition: institution-building, rule of law and the role of civil society
 - (b) WG II: Environmental impact of conflicts and rehabilitation measures
 - (c) WG III: Experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts
 - (d) SS I: Special session on challenges of transformation: a framework for economic recovery
 - (e) SS II: Special session on rule of law, good governance and the need to combat corruption
6. Closing plenary
 - (a) Rapporteurs' reports from the Implementation Review Meeting, the three working groups and the special sessions

(b) Concluding remarks and reading of the Chairperson's Summary

7. Closure of the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum

WORK PROGRAMME

Working hours: 10 a.m. - 1 p.m.
 3 p.m. - 6 p.m. (please also note special working hours)

	Tuesday 11 April	Wednesday 12 April	Thursday 13 April	Friday 14 April
Morning		PL (Items 3, 4) afterwards: WG I (Item 5(a)) WG II (Item 5(b))	WG I (Item 5(a)) WG II (Item 5(b)) afterwards: WG II (Item 5(b)) WG III (Item 5(c))	SS II (Item 5(e)) afterwards: PL (Items 6, 7)
Afternoon	PL (Items 1, 2)	WG II (Item 5(b)) WG III (Item 5(c)) afterwards: WG I (Item 5(a)) WG III (Item 5(c))	WG I (Item 5(a)) WG III (Item 5(c)) afterwards: SS I (Item 5(d))	

PL = Plenary meeting
 WG = Working Group
 SS = Special Session

DRAFT FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF WORKING GROUPS – “ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION: THE CHALLENGES OF TRANSFORMATION”

(Prague, 11-14 April 2000)

Working Group I: Economic Rehabilitation and Next Steps in the Transition:
Institution-Building, Rule of Law and the Role of Civil Society

Moderator: Mr. Herbert Salber, Germany

Co-Moderator: Mr. Andrei Aranbayev, Ashgabad Ecology Club
(CATENA), Turkmenistan

Rapporteur: Ms. Lea Swanson, USAID

Wednesday, 12 April

11.30 a.m. - 1 p.m. First Session: Integration of Minorities in Economic and Social Life

Presentations of reports by:

- Mr. Douglas Chalmers, Glasgow Caledonian University, delegated by the European Centre for Minority Issues
- Mr. Miles Litvinoff, Minority Rights Group (MRG) International
- Mr. Josef Aregger, Deputy Head, Swiss OSCE Delegation

Respondent: Ms. Helen Krag, University of Copenhagen

Wednesday, 12 April

5 p.m. - 6.30 p.m. Second Session: The Role of the Media and NGOs in Building Civil Society

Presentations of reports by:

- Ms. Lara Griffith, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)
- Mr. Oliver Money-Kyrle, International Federation of Journalists (IFJ)

Respondent: Ms. Elena Poptorova, Council of Europe,
Parliamentary Assembly

Thursday, 13 April

10 a.m. - 11.30 a.m. Third Session: The Need for Transparency, Good Governance and Strong Institutions to Combat Corruption

Presentations of mission reports by representatives of the:

- OSCE Mission to Georgia
- OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina
- OSCE Mission to Kosovo
- OSCE Presence in Albania

Respondent: Mr. Rory O'Sullivan, The World Bank

Thursday, 13 April

3 p.m. - 4.30 p.m. Fourth Session: Synthesis

Working Group II: Environmental Impact of Conflicts; Rehabilitation Measures

Moderator: Ambassador Irene Freudenschuss-Reichl, Austria

Co-Moderator: Mr. Marjan Dodovski, Deputy Minister of Environment, FYROM

Rapporteur: Mr. John Pearson, United Kingdom

Wednesday, 12 April

11.30 a.m. - 1 p.m. First Session: Environmental Impact of Conflicts; Rehabilitation Measures

Presentations of reports by:

- Mr. Pekka Haavisto, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Balkan Task Force
- Mr. Timo Mäkelä, European Commission (EC)

Respondent: Mr. Jernej Stritih, Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC)

Wednesday, 12 April

3 p.m. - 4.30 p.m. Second Session: Water and Energy Issues Affecting Economic Performance

Presentations of mission reports by representatives of the:

- OSCE Centre in Almaty
- OSCE Centre in Ashgabad

Respondent: Mr. Keith Sangway, European Commission (EC)

Thursday, 13 April

10 a.m. - 11.30 a.m. Third Session: Water and Energy Issues Affecting Economic Performance

Presentations of mission reports by representatives of the:

- OSCE Centre in Bishkek
- OSCE Liaison Office in Central Asia (Tashkent)

Respondent: Ms. Sue Milner, Natural Resources Institute (NRI)

Thursday, 13 April

1.15 p.m. Fourth Session: Synthesis

Working Group III: Experiences with Post-Conflict Rehabilitation Efforts

Moderator: Ambassador Jean-Michel Lacombe, HoM Georgia

Co-Moderator: Ms. Magda Stoczkiewicz, CEE Bankwatch Network

Rapporteur: Mr. Rainer Hermann, Personal Assistant to the Secretary General of the OSCE

Wednesday, 12 April

3 p.m. - 4.30 p.m. First Session: The Role of Women in Post-Conflict Rehabilitation

Presentations of mission reports by representatives of the:

- OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina
- OSCE Office in Yerevan

Respondent: Ms. Lara Griffith, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)

Wednesday, 12 April

5 p.m. - 6.30 p.m. Second Session: The Impact and the Return of Refugees

Presentations of mission reports by representatives of the:

- OSCE Presence in Albania
- OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje (FYROM), OSCE Mission to Croatia
- OSCE Mission to Kosovo

Respondent: Mr. Pierre-François Pirlot, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

Thursday, 13 April

11.45 a.m. - 1.15 p.m. Third Session: Cooperation Initiatives and Small Infrastructure Projects as Confidence-Building Measures

Presentations of mission reports by representatives of the:

- OSCE Mission to Georgia
- OSCE Mission to Moldova
- OSCE Mission to Tajikistan

Respondent: Mr. Christopher Cviic, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)

Thursday, 13 April

3 p.m. - 4.30 p.m. Fourth Session: Synthesis

Thursday, 13 April

4.45 p.m. - 6.45 p.m. Special Session on Challenges of Transformation: a Framework for Economic Recovery

Moderator: Ambassador Eva Nowotny, Chairperson of the Forum

Rapporteur: Mr. Victor Micula, Romania

Lead Speakers:

- Ms. Eugenia Date-Bah, International Labour Organization (ILO)
- Mr. Geoffrey Hamilton, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE)
- Mr. Simon Cherkezishvili, Executive Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

Friday, 14 April

8 a.m. - 10 a.m. Special Session on Rule of Law, Good Governance and the Need to Combat Corruption

Moderator: Mr. Hans-Peter Manz, Representative of the Chairperson-in-Office

Rapporteur: Mr. Hans-Michael Plut, Austria

Lead Speakers:

- Mr. Ludovico Aigrot, Council of Europe
- Mr. David Pearce, World Bank
- Mr. Daniel A. Bilak, Adviser to the Government of Ukraine

DRAFT WORKING AGENDA FOR THE EIGHTH MEETING OF
THE ECONOMIC FORUM 2000 – “ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF
POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION: THE
CHALLENGES OF TRANSFORMATION”

(Prague, 11-14 April 2000)

Tuesday, 11 April

10 a.m. - 6 p.m. Registration for the Economic Forum

2.30 p.m. Press Conference

3 p.m. - 3.30 p.m. Opening Plenary (open to the press)

Welcoming remarks by the Secretary General of the Ministry of
Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, Mr. Zdenek Matejka

Opening address by the Chairperson of the Forum,
Ambassador Eva Nowotny

Welcoming remarks by the Secretary General of the OSCE,
Ambassador Ján Kubiš

Presentation of the Activity Report of the Co-ordinator of OSCE
Economic and Environmental Activities, Mr. Thomas Price

3.30 p.m. - 6 p.m. Review of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the Economic
Dimension

General overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the
Economic Dimension by a representative of the UN/ECE
(Mr. Yves Berthelot, Executive Secretary)

Rapporteur: Ms. Ceren Yazgan-Etiz, Turkey

7 p.m. Working Dinner, hosted by the Chairperson of the Forum (for
moderators, co-moderators and rapporteurs)

Wednesday, 12 April

10 a.m. - 11.30 a.m. Plenary Session (open to the press)

Keynote address by the President of the Republic of Tajikistan,
Mr. Emomali Sharipovich Rakhmonov

Role and Challenges of the OSCE:

- Perspectives by a representative of the European Commission (Mr. Marc Franco, Director in the European Commission, former head of the EC Task Force for the reconstruction of Kosovo)
- Perspectives by a representative of the UN/ECE (Ms. Danuta Hübner)
- Perspectives by a representative of an NGO (Mr. John Fawcett, International Crisis Group)

Discussion of keynote addresses and introductory statements

11.30 a.m. - 1 p.m.

Working Group I; first session
Working Group II; first session

Working Group I:

Economic Rehabilitation and Next Steps in the Transition:
Institution-Building, Rule of Law and the Role of Civil Society

Moderator: Mr. Herbert Salber, Germany

Co-Moderator: Mr. Andrei Aranbayev, Ashgabad Ecology Club
(CATENA), Turkmenistan

Rapporteur: Ms. Lea Swanson, USAID

Working Group II:

Environmental Impact of Conflicts; Rehabilitation Measures

Moderator: Ambassador Irene Freudenschuss-Reichl, Austria

Co-Moderator: Mr. Marjan Dodovski, Deputy Minister of
Environment, FYROM

Rapporteur: Mr. John Pearson, United Kingdom

3 p.m. - 4.30 p.m.

Working Group III; first session
Working Group II; second session

Working Group III:

Experiences with Post-Conflict Rehabilitation Efforts

Moderator: Ambassador Jean-Michel Lacombe, HoM Georgia

Co-Moderator: Ms. Magda Stoczkiewicz, CEE Bankwatch Network

Rapporteur: Mr. Rainer Hermann, Personal Assistant to the
Secretary General of the OSCE

Working Group II:

Environmental Impact of Conflicts; Rehabilitation Measures

4.30 p.m.

Coffee break

5 p.m. - 6.30 p.m.

Working Group I; second session
Working Group III; second session

Working Group I: Economic Rehabilitation and Next Steps in the Transition:
Institution-Building, Rule of Law and the Role of Civil Society

Working Group III: Experiences with Post-Conflict Rehabilitation Efforts

7 p.m. Reception hosted by the Chairperson of the Forum

Thursday, 13 April

8.30 a.m. - 10 a.m. Working Breakfast with Business Community Representatives
Guest of honour: Mr. Petr Karas, President of the Confederation
of Industry of the Czech Republic

10 a.m. - 11.30 a.m. Working Group I; third session
Working Group II; third session

Working Group I: Economic Rehabilitation and Next Steps in the Transition:
Institution-Building, Rule of Law and the Role of Civil Society

Working Group II: Environmental Impact of Conflicts; Rehabilitation Measures

11.30 a.m. Coffee break

11.45 - 13.15 Working Group III; third session
Working Group II; fourth session

Working Group III: Experiences with Post-Conflict Rehabilitation Efforts

Working Group II: Environmental Impact of Conflicts; Rehabilitation Measures

3 p.m. - 4.30 p.m. Working Group I; fourth session
Working Group III; fourth session

Working Group I: Economic Rehabilitation and Next Steps in the Transition:
Institution-Building, Rule of Law and the Role of Civil Society

Working Group III: Experiences with Post-Conflict Rehabilitation Efforts

4.30 p.m. Coffee break

4.45 p.m. - 6.45 p.m. Special Session on Challenges of Transformation: A Framework for
Economic Recovery

Moderator: Ambassador Eva Nowotny, Chairperson of the Forum
Rapporteur: Mr. Victor Micula, Romania

Lead Speakers:

- Ms. Eugenia Date-Bah, International Labour Organization (ILO)
- Mr. Geoffrey Hamilton, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE)
- Mr. Simon Cherkezishvili, Executive Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

Friday, 14 April

8 a.m. - 10 a.m.

Special Session on Rule of Law, Good Governance and the Need to Combat Corruption

Moderator: Mr. Hans-Peter Manz, Representative of the Chairperson-in-Office

Rapporteur: Mr. Hans-Michael Plut, Austria

Lead Speakers:

- Mr. Ludovico Aigrot, Council of Europe
- Mr. David Pearce, World Bank
- Mr. Daniel A. Bilak, Adviser to the Government of Ukraine

10 a.m. - 1 p.m.

Closing Plenary (open to the press)

Rapporteurs' reports from the Implementation Review Meeting, the three Working Groups and the Special Sessions

Concluding remarks and reading of the Chairperson's summary

CHAIRPERSON'S SUMMARY OF
THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM

1. In accordance with Chapter VII of the 1992 Helsinki Decisions and pursuant to Decision No. 308 of 1 July 1999 and Decision No. 340 of 10 February 2000 of the Permanent Council (PC), the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum took place at the Czernin Palace in Prague from 11 to 14 April 2000. The participants in the Economic Forum were high-level representatives of participating States responsible for shaping international economic and environmental policy in the OSCE area. Several participating States included representatives of the private sector and non-governmental organizations in their delegations.

The Partners for Co-operation (Japan and the Republic of Korea) and the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia) were invited to participate in the Economic Forum.

The following international organizations were invited to participate in the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum: Council of Europe, Energy Charter Secretariat, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), European Environmental Agency, European Investment Bank, International Atomic Energy Agency, International Labour Organization (ILO), International Monetary Fund, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, World Health Organization and other relevant organizations.

The Chairperson also organized a special meeting of members of the business community being part of delegations with Mr. Petr Karas, President of the Association of Industrialists of the Czech Republic, during which the President spoke about perspectives and problems in industrial restructuring.

2. In contrast to preceding meetings of the Forum, representatives of OSCE field missions, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other relevant players were invited to present reports for the discussion in the Working Groups. The quality of the debate benefited greatly from the presence of respondents as well as from the preparation of background papers that were made available to the participants.

3. At the opening plenary, the representative of the host country, the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, Mr. Zdenek Matejka, the Secretary General of the OSCE, Ambassador Ján Kubiš, and the Chairperson, Ambassador Eva Nowotny, addressed the Economic Forum.

4. The opening plenary was also addressed by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (CEEAA), Mr. Thomas Price, who drew attention to emerging socio-economic problems and future challenges.

5. The review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension constituted the first part of the meeting. The Executive Secretary of the ECE gave an assessment of the performance of transition countries and advocated an approach that heeded

individual circumstances and diversity instead of applying uniform recipes. The ECE remained committed to supporting the process of reforms with analysis and advice.

6. During the discussion of the keynote speeches several distinct positions emerged. While a number of delegations urged the continuation of reforms, and more specifically reforms in the areas of law enforcement and institution-building, others argued for a more differentiated approach, taking into account the specific trajectories of transition of individual countries. In this context, attention was directed to the possible erosion of political legitimacy as a result of the social cost of reforms, which might force decision makers to dilute planned reforms or abandon them altogether. The creation of new jobs and economic growth were named as major factors that could generate political spin-offs. Criticism was directed at continuing trade practices that prevented fair competition on a level playing field. Also, the breakdown of major markets affected individual countries differently.

7. The plenary session on Wednesday, 12 April, opened with an address by Mr. Emomali Rakhmonov, the President of the Republic of Tajikistan, who gave an overview of the status of economic and political reforms in Tajikistan.

Other keynote addresses, delivered by Mr. Marc Franco (European Commission), Ms. Danuta Hübner (ECE) and Mr. John Fawcett (International Crisis Group), dealt with the lessons learned by the international community from the Kosovo case and the importance of basing rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts on realistic expectations, particularly when it comes to time-frames and the absorption capacities of aid recipients.

NGO representatives pointed out that a major problem generated by such situations was corruption, in which the international aid community could become an aiding and abetting partner. In their view, a reform of the donor community itself should be the answer. Some delegations, particularly from donor countries, saw a viable solution of the corruption problem in a strict separation and a withdrawal of government from the economy proper, as far as this was possible.

8. The discussion on the general theme of the Forum, "Economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation: the challenges of transformation", focused on the relationship between economics and politics. This duality is reflected in the organizational separation between political and economic international organizations as well as in the juxtaposition of profitability and political pay-offs. Problems arising from the fact that the boundaries of these two fields are blurred were identified and a clearer definition of the function and roles of the OSCE in the institutional landscape was sought. According to this view, a clear, predictable and transparent legal environment is of paramount importance. Reforms in the judiciary that support the economic independence and enhance the professional competence of judges were strongly encouraged. Other discussants pointed out that, in some cases, funds were misappropriated and investment decisions were made without transparency and without consideration of the social, environmental and political impact as well as the gender aspect of projects. Criticism was also directed at the practice of some emerging democracies of using international agreements, particularly in the field of environmental protection, as a symbolic confirmation of their sovereignty without a firm commitment to the stated objectives. On the other hand, several contributors to the debate underlined the positive role of sovereignty, empowering the emerging democracies to choose appropriate reform models and to prevent a relapse into dependency.

In relation to the OSCE's role in post-conflict rehabilitation, several speakers stressed that the OSCE, while not being a donor organization, must form an integral part of the complex rehabilitation effort. Drawing on its assets as a relatively flexible organization with a comprehensive approach, it should clearly define the political objectives of individual projects and assess their political outcome. In this context, delegations also underlined the important role and meaningful input of the OSCE's field missions and expressed their satisfaction at the presence of heads of missions at the Forum. In order to allow for an in-depth assessment of the OSCE's performance of its statutory objectives, participants stressed the importance of regular and more substantive activity reports by the CEEA. It was also recommended that the OSCE should enhance its co-operation and co-ordination with all international, subregional and non-governmental organizations with which it shared common values.

9. The discussions in the Working Groups focused on the following main subjects:

- (a) Economic rehabilitation and the next steps in the transition: institution-building, the rule of law and the role of civil society (Working Group I);
- (b) Environmental impact of conflicts; rehabilitation measures (Working Group II);
- (c) Experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts (Working Group III).

10. Working Group I underlined the importance of confidence-building between governments and minorities. The integration of minorities was recognized as a prerequisite for the integration of any State into European structures. The OSCE should continue to facilitate the integration of minorities in social life. The OSCE could also explore the impact of privatization on minorities.

With reference to NGOs, it was stated that they fulfilled an important role in the system of checks and balances and in civil society. They provided a repository of expertise and helped to develop training and advocacy skills.

OSCE mission representatives made presentations on the topic of transparency, good governance and strong institutions to combat corruption. Among factors contributing to corruption, the monopoly of public officers as well as groups benefiting from frozen conflicts were mentioned. Some delegations proposed that future OSCE activities might include, in the framework of the respective mission mandates, monitoring the actual state of implementation of initiatives to combat corruption as well as the identification of programmes and training needs. The CEEA and the ODIHR might also be tasked with contributing to this process.

11. Participants in Working Group II highlighted the importance of environmental co-operation both as a concrete conflict-prevention measure and as an indispensable element of post-conflict reconstruction and rehabilitation. They emphasized that impartial and independent technical assessments for fact-finding purposes (such as the Balkan Task Force report) could provide a useful common frame of reference. The Working Group reiterated support for the Regional Environmental Reconstruction Programme for South-Eastern Europe.

The discussions underlined the role of the OSCE in developing a shared understanding on various aspects of environmental issues in the context of conflict (such as costs of clean-up, organization of rapid intervention in environmental emergencies, parameters for successful regional environmental co-operation, etc.)

On water and energy issues in Central Asia, the Meeting confirmed that water management was one source of tension in the region. It stressed the need for framework agreements to strengthen co-ordination, including the setting up of a dispute settlement mechanism to reconcile competitive interests of the countries concerned. It also confirmed the need to strengthen existing regional organizations, the functioning of which would be enhanced by improved information flows and greater public participation.

A major role of the OSCE was seen as eliciting political backing for the process of negotiation of framework agreements supported by the Technical Assistance for the Commonwealth of Independent States TACIS WARMAP programme of the European Union and in particular for the early conclusion of the two regional agreements which have been agreed upon in principle. The OSCE also has a role to play in facilitating donor co-ordination and in enhancing the flow of information, making full use of its missions in the region in this regard.

On a practical level, the most important role for the OSCE was seen in the area of building institutional capacity and training of Central Asian officials and experts, especially in negotiation and consensus-building techniques, in international law, in participating in global and regional negotiation processes and in transferring international law into domestic law.

12. With reference to the role of women, Working Group III pointed out that post-conflict societies were split along gender lines, in that women tended to be affected in a different and more dramatic way than men. Since, however, the gender issue was highly complex in itself, the resulting pattern was by no means uniform and decreasing chances were complemented by new opportunities for women in other fields, such as small entrepreneurship.

For the affected countries, the magnitude and the composition of the refugee influx was a staggering problem in the reported cases, with far-reaching consequences for State and international budgets, the environment and the social infrastructure. When it came to the specific role for the OSCE in the refugee issue, the comprehensive approach linking the humanitarian, political and economic dimensions was mentioned as its major asset. The OSCE should, in close co-operation with the UNHCR and other relevant agencies, support and develop regional strategies promoting the return of refugees and internally displaced persons as well as participate in ensuring compliance with the programmes concerned.

Different views were expressed concerning the usefulness of fostering joint economic projects across the boundaries of conflict zones. Nevertheless, it was pointed out that the improvement of inter-ethnic relations was a powerful incentive for investors. With reference to the donor community, the urgent need for a streamlining of project finance was identified as the major problem. Lack of co-ordination led to redundant and overlapping programmes and wastage of resources.

13. The Forum also discussed, in a special session, the subject "Challenges of transformation: a framework for economic recovery".

Lead speeches were delivered by Ms. Eugenia Date-Bah (ILO), Mr. Christopher Cviic (EBRD) and Mr. Geoffrey Hamilton (UN/ECE).

While Ms. Date-Bah analysed the serious consequences of post-crisis situations for the labour market and the prospects for gainful employment of large parts of the population (especially women, farmers and other vulnerable groups), Mr. Cviic highlighted the positive involvement of the EBRD in assisting the development of small and medium-sized enterprises and private sector activities in general.

Mr. Hamilton drew on the long-standing experience of the ECE in South-East Europe to illustrate the difficulties of achieving economic stability and growth, with special emphasis on the expected positive impact of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

The second special session of the Forum dealt with “The rule of law, good governance and the need to combat corruption”. In their lead speeches, Mr. Ludovico Aigrot (Council of Europe) described the instruments established under the auspices of the Council to combat corruption (the Criminal and Civil Law Conventions, the Guiding Principles against Corruption, the GRECO monitoring mechanism and the Octopus II and PACO co-operation programmes), Mr. David Pearce (World Bank) gave an analysis of the efforts of the Bank to come to grips with this problem and Mr. Daniel A. Bilak (Adviser to the Government of Ukraine) presented a case study of the present situation in Ukraine.

Operational considerations

- It was emphasized that the economic dimension now needed more practical implementation measures than in the past. To that end, more substantial and meaningful inputs from the business community should be encouraged. Enhanced co-operation between the OSCE and specialized economic, environmental and financial institutions, as well as subregional organizations, remained a priority. NGOs, as an indispensable link to civil society, were strategic partners.
- At the same time, the value and the impact of the Economic Forum within the OSCE needed to be enhanced. There was wide agreement that the major results of the Forum should be fed back into the practical activities of the Secretariat and the field missions. The missions should be invited in their turn to give their assessment of the activities of the Forum. Also, regular discussion of the economic dimension in the Permanent Council was recommended, as well as joint presentations of ECE and Forum reports to the PC and requests to the missions to produce spot reports on economic and environmental issues with security implications covered by their respective mandates.
- The Chairperson was pleased to observe that the new format of the Forum was welcomed and commended by many participants. Nevertheless, it is imperative to consider suggestions for further improvement. For example, an assessment procedure that aims at identifying successful arrangements, topics and other practices to be continued the following year could be helpful.
- The idea that the CEEA should continue to present an activity report was strongly supported during the debates. If well implemented, this could be an effective tool for

fostering activities in the economic dimension and producing concrete results. Each Chairperson-in-Office should take responsibility for the elaboration of the work programme and its execution by the CEEA.

- There was general agreement that efforts to delimit roles and jurisdictions and to distribute responsibilities among international organizations engaged in similar activities, in order to avoid duplication and wasteful use of funds, needed to be intensified. The OSCE could assume a co-ordinating role in this process.
- Field experience from post-conflict rehabilitation confirms that the settlement of regional conflicts is a precondition for large-scale political and economic co-operation, but that, conversely, economic activities can also give a decisive thrust to the peace process. The need to integrate economic strategies into the OSCE's political portfolio, particularly in the operative work of the Missions, becomes increasingly apparent.
- There was general agreement that the next Meeting of the Economic Forum should take place in Prague, possibly in May 2001. Following consultations, it is envisaged that the overall theme of the Forum should be "Transparency and good governance in economic matters". It was suggested that the Meeting of the 2002 Forum might address the broad issue of the socio-economic impact of disarmament.
- It was agreed that the next Meeting of the Forum should again be prepared, *inter alia*, by seminars. These seminars should be focused both geographically and thematically. Preparations should be the responsibility of the incoming chairmanship. They should take place at an early point, so that a decision with regard to the sub-themes of the Forum could be built on conclusions derived from the seminars.
- With a view to the organization of the Ninth Meeting of the Economic Forum, the Chairperson-in-Office has, as from 1 May this year, delegated responsibility for the preparations for this event to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Romania.

REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS
IN THE ECONOMIC DIMENSION

Tuesday, 11 April 2000

Report of the Rapporteur

1. The meeting was opened by the Austrian Chair, Ambassador Eva Nowotny.
2. Mr. Yves Berthelot, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, gave a general overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and the environmental dimension. With reference to the paper presented to the Forum by the ECE, Mr. Berthelot drew attention to the fact that the past decade had witnessed some progress with respect to the process of economic transition. Mr. Berthelot also emphasized that there could not be a single formula for success in the solution of problems facing the economies in transition. The increasing differences in the level of prosperity between different States and regions, as well as within the OSCE countries, were mentioned as a possible source of tension. The need for investment in terms of both capital and training and a correct assessment of the cost of reform to the people, and the importance of institution-building, co-operation among States in the field of the environment and a better utilization of statistics to allow more stable and realistic policy-making, were indicated as some of the lessons learned from the transition process so far.

Some specific recommendations made by Mr. Berthelot to the OSCE were:

- To encourage the ratification and implementation of existing agreements in the environmental field;
 - To devote efforts to stimulating awareness and public participation in decision-making processes regarding environmental issues;
 - To follow the example of some other institutions in monitoring the effects of economic issues on vulnerable groups such as women, the elderly, minorities, etc.
3. During the general debate that followed, delegations stressed the following issues among others:
 - OSCE commitments are not compiled in a single document and have evolved over the years, and approaches to the review of these commitments also vary. However, there has been a visible improvement in the review process thanks to the efforts of the Chairperson-in-Office and the Secretariat;
 - The co-operation between the OSCE and other international organizations, particularly the ECE, is to be welcomed and should be further enhanced;
 - The link between all dimensions of security is obvious and the OSCE's economic dimension should be strengthened;

- Discussion of the economic aspects of security in the Permanent Council is to be welcomed;
 - In the light of the Charter for European Security and the Istanbul Summit Declaration, the OSCE should dwell on ways and means of combating corruption and strengthening the rule of law throughout the OSCE area in co-ordination with other international institutions;
 - There is a need to renew the commitments in the light of the changes that have occurred in the past decade, and the Bonn Document should also be reviewed;
 - Regional stabilization and assistance programmes such as the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe are useful, especially when they provide benefits for local economies; such regional co-operation schemes could be applied in other regions;
 - Aid programmes should be developmental rather than humanitarian in post-conflict environments;
 - A joint study on globalization could help governments in analysing its possible effects on their respective economies;
 - New dividing lines in the OSCE area should be avoided. Some participating States are concerned about the introduction of new visa regimes that may affect business relations adversely. Some other participating States are concerned about restrictions on trade;
 - Different perspectives as alternatives to integration into specific groupings are necessary for countries in transition in order to avoid frustration;
 - An OSCE fund for assisting participating States that face environmental disasters should be considered.
4. The Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities submitted to the Forum a written report covering the activities of his office.

WORKING GROUP I

Thursday, 13 April 2000

Report of the Working Group Rapporteur

Agenda item 5(a): Economic rehabilitation and the next steps in the transition:
institution-building, rule of law and the role of civil society

Introduction

Welcoming delegates to the Working Group I discussion, the moderators invited them to approach the subject of economic rehabilitation in participating States and the next steps in transition from three key perspectives:

- Integration of minorities in economic and social life;
- The role of the media and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in building civil society;
- The need for transparency, good governance and strong institutions to combat corruption.

Delegates were also invited to focus their contributions on “the next steps” so that constructive recommendations could be developed by the Working Group for OSCE consideration.

Integration of minorities in economic and social life

A foundation for discussion was established by three keynote speakers and a respondent. The role of the State was recognized as one of market correction and of developing public rules to allow markets to flourish. In this context, an important challenge noted was the issue of “distribution inequality” and, specifically, how to build economic and political mechanisms that involved minorities in economic development. Speakers also emphasized that human rights were linked to economic and social issues and that bottom-up approaches – as well as top-down approaches – were required to integrate minorities into decision-making processes. Such approaches required painstaking consultations to develop human understanding and trust between minority citizens and other stakeholders, including governments. Marginalization of minorities arose as an issue, together with the recommendation that there be no breach between forums dealing with minority issues and economic issues. One delegate voiced concern about the treatment of ethnic minorities by some other States. The necessity for the OSCE to continue monitoring the situation was noted. The integration of minorities was recognized as a prerequisite for integration of any State in European structures. A western example of a country accommodating many different minorities underlined the need to bridge the gap between States in the west with a democratic history and States in transition. This western example also raised a number of questions. For example, do we ensure that languages used in co-operation projects are also those spoken by the minorities? When working on democracy-building projects, do we always see to it that

the principle of subsidiarity is sufficiently abided by? How can we influence private investors to give attention to the impact of their investment decisions on the social and economic integration of minorities in the society? It was also clear from the introductory remarks that while many market economies in Western Europe have trouble integrating minorities, it is even harder for countries in transition.

Delegates responded with a number of examples of country-specific activities being proposed or undertaken to establish national structures and institutions made it possible to integrate minorities and combat corruption. Examples included the need to elaborate some sort of code of conduct to resolve conflicts in the distribution of resources, such as access to credit. Rules to support the rights of minorities as privatization moved ahead in transition countries were also proposed, and the need for mutual trust, respect and tolerance was emphasized. The role of trade unions in fostering inter-ethnic co-operation and economic rehabilitation through the training of trade union members from different ethnic groups was also recognized.

Recommendations for future OSCE activities include: (1) working with host country counterparts to enhance the perception of the worth of local culture; (2) exploring the effects of privatization on minorities and unequal distribution; (3) OSCE links with the 2001 World Conference on Racism which will address ethnic discrimination; and (4) continued efforts by the OSCE to facilitate the integration of minorities in social life.

The role of the media and NGOs in building civil society

Two speakers introduced the topic of the role of the media and NGOs in building civil society. Their remarks highlighted the importance of recognizing the media and journalists as part of the structure for civil society and also the need for careful regulation of this segment of society. Special emphasis was given to the need for programmes to support independent journalism and the principles of public service broadcasting. The need for media self-regulation was also noted, as was the issue of protection of journalists. On the subject of NGOs, it was stated that NGOs played an important "checks and balances" role in civil society. They provided a reservoir of expertise and developed training and advocacy skills, although implementation capacity was less well developed. The importance of fostering a culture of consultation was underlined to ensure that NGOs had a role in developing public policy. Speakers also noted that NGOs were not without their problems. There was a tendency for NGOs to become self-justifying in order to access funds.

Delegates emphasized the need for the international community to share responsibility in the world democratization process and the fact that democracy was delayed by conflict. The lack of information restricted development and exacerbated security issues. Where there was less democracy, there was less chance for the role of NGOs to be effective. And it was also apparent that where there was little effective NGO activity, there was less chance for democracy to take root. Delegates noted that while there were many NGOs in transition countries, less than one per cent of those NGOs were working well. A plea was made for support for fledgling NGO movements in transition countries, and for including the workplace under the umbrella of OSCE concerns as an inalienable part of civil society. Delegates also noted country-specific barriers to NGO development such as registration requirements. Where governments did not support a given NGO, registration could be denied. International donors were also identified by delegates as supporting financially driven coalitions that worked against grass-roots NGOs. Donor funds tended to go to the

NGOs that knew how to write proposals, yet it was the grass-roots NGOs that had the confidence of local communities. A call was made for the provision of training for NGOs so that they did not become dependent on funding. The Aarhus Convention was cited as a good example of an existing vehicle and an impetus for the role of civil society in decision-making. Yet it was also noted that only eight participating States had ratified the Convention.

Recommendations for future OSCE activities: (1) include the place where people work in the sphere of concern of OSCE activities; (2) facilitate NGO and media co-operation with international agencies; (3) facilitate the co-ordination of the work of NGOs through coalitions of NGOs.

The need for transparency, good governance and strong institutions to combat corruption

Presentations were made by OSCE Mission representatives from Georgia, Albania, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and also by a representative from the World Bank, to introduce delegates to the topic of transparency, good governance and institutions to combat corruption. It was noted that corruption was a complex issue that could not be easily explained. The circular nature of the phenomenon of corruption was underlined. Governments that were deprived of tax revenue were unable to pay public officials adequate salaries and those employees in turn had recourse to corrupt practices to supplement their incomes. Other contributing factors noted by the speakers included: monopoly positions of public officers that issued licences and permits; political control of State institutions; excessive administrative procedures, and even close-knit family structures. OSCE missions were working to address many of these contributing factors, including working at the local level to provide training in good governance, management, capital project design and planning, and holding public hearings to obtain citizen input to the decision-making process. Other actions included working with host country counterparts to introduce provisions concerning conflict of interest to separate politics from the judiciary and economic decision-making. Deregulation was noted as an important tool to reduce the proliferation of monopoly positions. It was also noted that the post-conflict situation provided an opportunity to develop new ideas and systems rather than to rebuild old systems. The Stability Pact, focusing on South-Eastern Europe, was cited as an example of action to combat corruption. The anti-corruption component of the Stability Pact established benchmarks against which countries in the region could compare their progress in combating corruption. The comparisons would be published, fostering transparency and collaboration.

Delegates emphasized that the fight against corruption, and in favour of good governance and transparency, was a means to achieve human security and prosperity. This higher objective must be kept in view. To combat corruption and foster good governance and transparency, delegates noted the importance of strong national institutions, and this might include efficient and effective regulatory structures. The importance of working at the grass-roots level was also emphasized, to ensure citizen participation in decision-making and combating corruption. Other approaches to combating corruption cited by delegates included criminalizing corruption and harmonizing national criminal law with the Council of Europe. Efficient co-operation to detect corruption in its earliest stages was another approach to preventing the spread of corrupt practices, combined with an independent judiciary. A number of delegates stressed that increased public awareness and political will were necessary preconditions to combating corruption. Finally, delegates noted that in many countries public awareness of the problem of corruption existed and in some OSCE mission countries the fight against corruption had been declared a top priority of host governments.

However, it was less clear whether the intention to fight corruption was reflected by evidence of implementation.

Recommendations for future OSCE activities included: (1) verify whether stated intentions to fight corruption are borne out by actual implementation actions – important for all participating States; (2) in addition to formal OSCE reporting, identify needs for training; and (3) provide technical legal assistance in areas such as taxation, consumer legislation, corporate governance, conflict-of-interest rules.

WORKING GROUP II

Thursday, 13 April 2000

Report of the Working Group Rapporteur

Agenda item 5(b): Environmental impact of conflicts and rehabilitation measures

Environmental impact of conflicts and rehabilitation measures (first session)

Mr. Pekka Haavisto of the Balkan Task Force of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) gave an outline of the Task Force's work following the Kosovo conflict. Mr. Timo Makela explained the regional co-operation work of the European Union (EU) in South-East Europe while the respondent, Mr. Jernej Stritih, covered the current activity of the Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe.

The Balkan Task Force has investigated the environmental consequences of the Kosovo conflict. It found that four "hotspots" in Serbia required immediate attention, and has appealed for international support to implement clean-up projects. The main conclusions from the work were:

- That the mechanism of an independent post-conflict environmental assessment worked well, allowing an objective analysis that overcame wider political factors;
- That much of the pollution in the region pre-dated the conflict, as a result of industrial activities;
- That while the conflict did not cause an environmental catastrophe, it resulted in serious problems in the immediately affected area and adjacent countries (e.g. through resultant refugee flows).

Participants thought that various issues relating to post-conflict situations needed further consideration. These included:

- Whether there was a need for an environmental emergency intervention organization (e.g. Green Helmets). Few organizations had the capacity to carry out this work at present. This could be included in consideration of the REACT (Rapid Expert Assistance and Co-operation Team) initiative;
- Who had the responsibility to finance clean-up work after conflicts. There was currently no consensus between the "polluter pays" and "loser pays" options;
- How military planning should take wider account of the likely environmental effect, to try to minimize damage. Many established military practices resulted in widespread negative consequences;
- Greater promotion of the need for conflict prevention, which was cheaper in the long term than conflict resolution and clean-up.

The Working Group reiterated that regional environmental co-operation was important for peace and stability in South-Eastern Europe. There was currently strong political support for the approach embodied in the Regional Environmental Reconstruction Programme for South-Eastern Europe, which is probably the first example of a co-ordinated regional environmental response to a conflict. The Regional Environment Centre has produced a project portfolio which has been endorsed by all Environment Ministers from the region. This could play an important role in promoting long term security and co-operation in the region. The proposal aims to:

- Strengthen existing institutions in the region, such as Environment Ministries;
- Improve the capacity of civil society and the legislature;
- Provide emergency assistance for combating war damage;
- Reinforce existing co-operative mechanisms and develop regional cross-border projects;
- Support priority national and local environmental projects.

Representatives from the region thought that environmental problems would only lead to conflict if aggravated by political motivations: as they were common problems they would be more likely to result in co-operation. The following factors were seen as crucial for successful co-operation:

- The need for a shared political commitment to resolving or tackling the environmental issue;
- Use of an established framework, such as an international Convention, in tandem with national environmental policies based on sustainable good governance;
- The involvement of all stakeholders, including the government, NGOs and business, thereby ensuring that the population was fully involved in the process;
- Clear and concrete objectives for co-operation;
- The need to co-ordinate environmental actions with economic, health and social policies, to ensure an integrated approach;
- The existence of an independent organization willing to play the role of honest broker to build confidence.

The Group recognized the importance of the Stabilization and Association Process now launched between the EU and countries of South-East Europe and expressed its support.

Delegations noted the suggestion at the Seventh Meeting of the Economic Forum for a seminar to define the role of the OSCE in the evolving debate on environmental security issues.

Water and energy issues affecting economic performance (second and third sessions)

The OSCE missions in Almaty, Ashgabad, Bishkek and Tashkent presented reports on the existing regional distribution of water resources and energy generation in Central Asia. The respondents, Mr. Keith Sangway of the European Commission and Ms. Sue Milner of the Natural Resources Institute, outlined their thoughts on future arrangements in the region. The strong link between the two factors, with water traded for energy supplies between countries, was highlighted.

The Working Group heard how a delegation led by the United Kingdom had visited the region in March to discuss ways of tackling problems with regional water distribution. The mission had proposed a high-level political meeting between the countries later in the year 2000. This had been supported by Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Uzbekistan had given a cautious response, while Turkmenistan believed that the countries of the region had to resolve any problems without wider international co-ordination. The mission had concluded that the idea of a high-level meeting was valid but that now was not the right time to pursue the suggestion.

The Group considered what role international organizations, notably the OSCE, might have in promoting international water co-operation in Central Asia. Suggestions of a more political nature included:

- Encouraging the countries to support the EU's TACIS (Technical Assistance for the Commonwealth of Independent States) programme, which had produced two framework agreements that were ready for signature, on institutional structures and information exchange; supporting work on finalizing the other three proposed agreements, on use of water in present conditions, joint planning and ecology/water quality;
- A forum for regional participants to meet and discuss issues relating to energy and water. This could explore mutual areas of interest, and enhance participation in global processes such as the World Water Forum, the global energy negotiations of the CSD and the climate change negotiations;
- Encouraging the countries of the region to join the relevant United Nations conventions or develop their own legal frameworks on the basis of these conventions;
- Improved donor co-ordination and information exchange;
- An independent, up-to-date assessment of the problems in the region and practical suggestions for ways to improve co-operation;
- A dispute settlement mechanism.

Practical suggestions included:

- Increasing the capacity of local institutions, leading to a greater understanding of international environmental conventions and practice, the development and

implementation of local legislation, information flows, negotiating skills and consensus building;

- Enhancing NGO capacity, including support for a conference in Uzbekistan from 11 to 14 May on market and water resources, and a planned OSCE seminar in Almaty which would coincide with a meeting of Environment Ministers of Europe and the CIS;
- Increasing OSCE involvement in water issues, including increased expertise in Vienna and the field and increased contacts with other key players, to allow a more informed debate with technical experts involved in existing initiatives;
- Education and training in areas such as consumer awareness and water use efficiency;
- A database of information on national institutions and existing work in the area;
- Supporting the work of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), to increase NGO governmental interchange;
- Improved co-operation between local organizations.

The participants thought that there was a real problem related to tensions arising over water management in the region; that a useful way of addressing these tensions could be to strengthen the institutions for regional co-operation, on which discussions were already taking place; and that the OSCE should lend its support to this process. Some thought that while international efforts might initially concentrate on the five countries of the region, in the long term other participants such as China, Afghanistan and Iran might need to be included. In addition, the Caspian Sea was highlighted as a major problem, where the issue was not one of water distribution, but of environmental degradation.

Issues relevant to the River Danube were raised, and an offer was made to exchange information on regional co-operation mechanisms concerning the Danube with Central Asian organizations.

WORKING GROUP III

Thursday, 13 April 2000

Report of the Working Group Rapporteur

Agenda item 5(c): Experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts

Introduction

Three specific areas for consideration were referred to during the discussions of Working Group III in the context of post-conflict rehabilitation: the role of women; the impact of refugees; co-operation initiatives and small infrastructure projects as confidence-building measures. The Working Group is a follow-up to the preparatory seminar held in Tbilisi on 26 and 27 January 2000.

The Moderator structured the discussions and conclusions along the following lines: problem areas, experiences, special concerns, lessons learned and recommendations. Here, the summary of the discussions on each of the three topics is subdivided accordingly.

I. THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION

The first session of the Working Group was dedicated to the analysis of the role of women in the process of post-conflict rehabilitation.

During both case studies (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Armenia), it was made clear that:

- The conflict period itself had a negative effect on the role of women in the society;
- This was to be seen in the broader context of transition from a socialist system to democracy, and from transition from conflict to a post-conflict situation.

The following general observations were made (in the light of experience):

Post-conflict societies were acutely “gendered”. Women came out of the conflict with fewer resources but greater burdens to bear. Women tended to get marginalized in political decision-making. On the economic side, employment opportunities for women had decreased. They were either excluded from the labour market entirely or held low-pay jobs. There was a similar tendency in the field of education.

However, the transition of the economy and the opening of the societies also provided new openings and chances for women in post-conflict societies: the new small and medium enterprise (SME) sector, for example, created new job opportunities. Women played a major role in the NGO sector which had emerged during the transition period. The communicative skills of women and their ability to adapt were mentioned in this context.

An impetus in favour of traditionalization and the reassertion of patriarchy had been observed, which worked against those new opportunities for women (NGOs, SMEs) in

post-conflict societies. The new roles for women were not always fully accepted in patriarchal societies. Partly in that context, an increase in violence against women had been observed.

Specific concerns expressed

One participating State expressed concern about the tendency for sections of the international community to try to undertake “social engineering” in transitional countries, which were in stress situations. The gender issue was highly complex in itself, and it was questionable whether the stressful post-conflict situation was the best time to solve it.

Recommendations

- Awareness among both women and men of the problems of women in post-conflict societies needed to be enhanced. The OSCE should encourage programmes with this aim;
- As gender aspects were linked with the overall challenges of transition, a simultaneous approach addressing gender equality, democratization and security was crucial;
- Progress should not be imposed, but must come from within the society. OSCE should play the role of a facilitator in this regard;
- Different means of empowering women should be explored, reflecting a country’s specificity. Training could be an important instrument to assist women in assuming a more significant role in society;
- It was also recommended that the positive experience with women in the NGO sector should be expanded to the economy. The establishment of micro-credit programmes would be a useful tool for this purpose;
- The Gender Action Plan should be adopted by the Permanent Council and be fully implemented. In addition, reports of all OSCE bodies should reflect gender issues.

II. THE IMPACT OF REFUGEES

The second main area of concern discussed in the Working Group was the impact of refugees on the post-conflict rehabilitation process. Three mission reports (Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Croatia) were presented on this issue.

Problem areas and general experiences

In general, the extent of refugee influx was an overwhelming problem in all cases that were discussed – with severe consequences for the social infrastructure. For example, we heard from the report from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia that, in connection with the refugee crisis, the entire State budget for 1999 had been spent in June of that year.

It was an enormous burden also on the environmental situation of the recipient States. Of particular concern were waste water management and the poor sewerage systems.

At the same time, a large amount of international resources was channelled to these States, which had significant side effects on their economic development. In fact, in the case of Albania, we heard that the rehabilitation measures of the international community had helped to bring about a status of the environment and infrastructure which was in some cases even better than before the crisis.

The attitude of the recipient country towards the refugee question was crucial. The example of Croatia was mentioned, where the change from a nationalistic to a democratic oriented agenda also had a positive impact on the situation of refugees.

The improvement of inter-ethnic relations was a helpful factor in developing a positive climate for investments.

The impact of refugees was often not restricted to one country, but had a regional dimension. Another phenomenon was that certain refugee groups had established new roots in the regions that they had fled to.

On the side of donor agencies, active co-ordination efforts were stressed as a positive factor. Another lesson learned was that international co-ordination was important not only during the implementation of assistance, but already at a planning stage.

Specific concerns

One participating State pointed to the imbalance in resettlement policy and urged a more balanced approach. The role of the OSCE should develop from monitoring to assisting.

One participant challenged the view that peace should be a prerequisite to economic aid. Holding back aid might in some cases cause a deterioration of political stability.

Recommendations that were voiced

- The role of the OSCE should be to maintain a position at the intersection between politics and economic aid;
- Humanitarian, political and economic dimensions should be approached together. The particular approach of the OSCE was defined by its comprehensiveness. All components should be taken into consideration when policies were defined: aid – environment – economy – security;
- Improved, sustainable regional co-operation across borders could ameliorate the situation;
- Activities of the local NGO community targeting refugee problems should be supported. Similarly, the competitiveness of local and regional enterprises should be assisted, e.g., by using them as preferred implementers for rehabilitation projects;
- Procurement should be done locally as much as possible, considering both the possible impact it had on local markets and international procurement standards;

- The OSCE should, in co-operation with the UNHCR and other relevant agencies, support existing regional strategies on the return of refugees and internally displaced persons as well as participate in ensuring compliance with such programmes.

III. CO-OPERATION INITIATIVES AND SMALL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AS CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

A third complex issue covered co-operation initiatives and small infrastructure projects as confidence-building measures. Reports from Georgia and Tajikistan were discussed.

Problem areas and experiences

The reports highlighted the significance of the economic dimension in resolving conflicts and contributing to the post-conflict rehabilitation process.

During the session, the view was expressed that in some cases, when appropriate and applicable, economic projects and co-operation initiatives could be instruments of conflict resolution. Another view was that, in other cases, economic co-operation should be preceded by a political settlement.

Projects implemented on a grass-roots or micro level had been successful, because they could be quickly launched and helped to mobilize local resources, and contribute to the creation of a sense of local ownership.

The lack of co-ordination among donors sometimes resulted in redundant, overlapping programmes. Funding was often a slow and cumbersome process. Another problem to be dealt with was, in certain cases, a tendency towards corruption among local recipients.

The successful implementation of a peace agreement could lead to an increase in international attention, as was now observed in Tajikistan.

Specific concerns

The representative of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) explained on behalf of his institution that it had been created to support the transition process mainly in the private sector, but when implementing projects it also paid great attention to the implementation of political reforms. The EBRD also welcomed the increased attention paid by the OSCE to field missions.

Ukraine and Romania expressed the wish that the OSCE should encourage the efforts under way aimed at creating conditions for the resumption of free navigation on the River Danube.

Recommendations

- The OSCE should, within its comprehensive approach, increase its involvement in economic projects;

- Projects targeting the micro level should be given more priority, but must at the same time go hand in hand with those at the macro level;
- The OSCE should continue to play a key role as a facilitator of co-operation between different groups involved in post-conflict rehabilitation;
- The OSCE should promote a regional approach to rehabilitation and economic development.

IV. SOME CONCLUSIONS

Although, as initially stated, the Working Group dealt with three separate aspects within the post-conflict rehabilitation process, some specific points were repeatedly reflected throughout all sessions of the Group:

The need for **regional approaches** when addressing post-conflict rehabilitation tasks was repeatedly mentioned during the discussion, although this was not supported by all participants.

A second point was the need for further **enhancement of co-ordination efforts**, among both donors and recipients. While not seen as a being a donor organization, the OSCE had a particularly important role as a facilitator.

The **comprehensiveness of the OSCE approach** seems to be a clear comparative institutional advantage of the OSCE. In each aspect of the post-conflict rehabilitation process that was discussed in the Working Group, the need for a multidimensional approach was stressed. Economic, environmental, gender, democratization, political and security aspects were all linked and must be reviewed and addressed together.

SPECIAL SESSION I

Thursday, 13 April 2000

Report of the Rapporteur of Special Session I

Agenda item 5(d): Special session on challenges of transformation: A framework for economic recovery

The Special Session on Challenges of Transformation was moderated by Ambassador Eva Nowotny, ably assisted by the lead speakers: Mr. Christopher Cviic (EBRD), Ms. Eugenia Date-Bah (ILO) and Mr. Geoffrey Hamilton (UN/ECE).

The first presentation tried to underline the need for a more balanced approach in assessing the challenges facing the transition processes within the OSCE area, as well as to provide a quick review of the negative and positive outcomes of the reform processes. The changing focus of the EBRD and the need to discard illusions in relations between donors and recipients were also mentioned. Thus, efforts to achieve economic transformation should incorporate both ideal and concrete material interests.

The next presentation highlighted the fact that an effective framework for post-conflict economic recovery has to be comprehensive, encompassing not only economic but also social and political measures. It was also stressed that the challenge for post-conflict rehabilitation and reconstruction programmes is to contribute to economic recovery not by re-establishing the status quo ante characterized by economic and other inequalities, social exclusion and the absence of democracy, which may have been among the structural, if not the immediate, factors that triggered the conflict in the first place; instead, they should facilitate positive change, generate opportunities for constructive and productive work, strengthen social inclusion and human security and generally promote a more just and equitable society. In order to achieve these aims, an integrated set of measures is needed, such as: the correction of macro-economic imbalances and the implementation of relevant employment promotion strategies; support for individual and community coping mechanisms; and the promotion of direct programmes of job creation, income generation, social integration, social dialogue, social safety nets and social protection.

The last presentation addressed the challenge of bringing about the regeneration of the whole South East European region in order to establish economic stability and economic growth and to lay the basis for future economic prosperity, thus reducing the risks to security in the future. It was suggested that the framework for recovery should consist of policies that promote sustained economic growth. Macroeconomic stability is required, but emphasis on building the right market institutions is also needed. The key challenges are both economic and non-economic in nature. The Stability Pact is moving in the right direction, but to maintain progress it is necessary to emphasize the importance of regional co-operation and the ownership of the Stability Pact by the countries themselves through the development of their own national programmes, and to support the development of the domestic private sector. It was underlined that the economic regeneration of the region will not be accomplished quickly, and that it will be a long-term commitment. At the same time, it was

mentioned that the OSCE's continued focus on this region will be important, and that there is a need for the OSCE to turn its attention to the social/legal paradigm.

During the debate that followed the presentations, the participants emphasized the following: the fact that there is no universal panacea; the need for the right balance between State regulation and market regulation; the importance of an objective evaluation of recipients by donors; the need to co-ordinate the donor community; the need to raise awareness of the assistance available; the importance of regional co-operation; and the need for the rule of law and a strong civil society.

During the debate, a number of delegations took the floor in order to put forward specific proposals, such as:

- One delegation suggested that the OSCE should work on economic and social monitoring;
- Another delegation suggested that, after the Annual Session of the UN/ECE, the Chairperson-in-Office should invite a senior representative of the UN/ECE to address the Permanent Council and to present the conclusions of the Annual Session;
- The same delegation suggested the organization of a joint UN/ECE-OSCE seminar in Vienna during the autumn;
- This delegation also suggested that, within the framework of inter-institutional co-operation, a special investigation should be conducted concerning the issue of ethnic discrimination in the labour market;
- The delegation also underlined the fact that, in monitoring commitments, the OSCE should focus not just on the commitments of States to economic reform but also to the commitments of the countries in the rest of Europe to supporting prosperity and stability in the region;
- Furthermore, the delegation suggested that there is a need for a new document (comparable with the Bonn Document) that corresponds to new realities.

SPECIAL SESSION II

Friday, 14 April 2000

Report of the Rapporteur of Special Session II

Agenda item 5(e): Special session on rule of law, good governance and the need to combat corruption

The Special Session on Rule of Law, Good Governance and the Need to Combat Corruption was moderated by Hans-Peter Manz. The lead speakers were Mr. Aigrot from the Council of Europe, Mr. Pearce from the World Bank and Mr. Bilak, Adviser to the Government of Ukraine.

The presentation by Mr. Aigrot gave an overview of the Council's activities and instruments in the field of fighting corruption. He emphasized that the Council of Europe has adopted a multi-disciplinary approach in fighting the phenomenon of corruption, and further elaborated on the Council's follow-up mechanism to the Criminal and Civil Law Conventions, the GRECO Agreement (Council of Europe's Group of States against Corruption). Members compliance with the Council's 20 Guiding Principles for the fight against corruption is mentioned by the GRECO mechanism. As regards regional initiatives, Mr. Aigrot discussed the Stability Pact Anti-Corruption Initiative for South-Eastern Europe (SPAI). By building on existing actions and through better co-ordination of all efforts the Anti-Corruption Initiative intends to intensify the fight against corruption in the region. The Council of Europe contributes to this initiative through the PACO programme.

The Council's future work endeavours will include the rapid adoption of a model code of conduct for public officials as well as work on topics such as party finances and problems posed by off-shore centres. The 4th Conference of Specialized Services in the Fight against Corruption which was held in Cyprus last year dealt with the subject of international co-operation in the fight against corruption and off-shore centres.

In his presentation Mr. Pearce dealt with the links between corruption and economic development and the role of donor and technical assistance agencies in the fight against corruption. As to the implications of this phenomenon, he pointed to the necessary reforms in both corporate and public governance and the implementation of anti-corruption measures. The World Bank's technical assistance in the fight against corruption is based on a comprehensive policy dialogue with all relevant government agencies, including reforms in economic policy and legal/judicial systems.

In his country report on Ukraine, Mr. Bilak concentrated on the systemic relationship between corruption and the rule of law. Some of the vital rule of law issues are the establishment of a code of ethics for public officials, setting up a registry of property rights, training education for judiciary bodies, development of an independent bar association and adequate pay for public officials.

During the general debate that followed, delegations stressed among others the following issues:

- The background paper prepared by the Chairmanship and information on existing instruments and mechanisms for fighting corruption should be made available to OSCE field missions.
- The Istanbul mandate should also be reflected in concrete OSCE activities on the ground. ODIHR and the Office of the Co-ordinator for Economic and Environmental Activities should work closely with OSCE field missions.
- Ratification procedures of the relevant OECD/CoE conventions have to be accelerated.
- The duplication of existing efforts by international organizations has to be avoided.
- One of the core values of the OSCE's work could be to enhance the political visibility of the phenomenon by raising awareness, disseminating information on existing norms and standards and supporting local structures.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

(as notified by delegations)

ALBANIA

Mr. Roland BIMO	Ambassador, Head of the Albanian Delegation to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. Adrian MARA	Specialist, Department of Economic Co-operation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Ms. Diana VELESHNJA	Head of Foreign Affairs Department, Ministry of Privatization
Ms. Etleva RUSTEMAJ	Project Manager, Ministry of Public Economy and Privatization

GERMANY

Mr. Reinhard BETTZUEGE	Ambassador, Head of Delegation, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. Herbert SALBER	Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE, Vienna
Mrs. Liselore CYRUS	Head of Department (OSCE, CoE Affairs), German Federal Foreign Office, Berlin
Mr. Joachim HACKER	First Counsellor, Task Force Reform States, German Federal Foreign Office, Berlin
Mr. Maximilian HURNAUS	Counsellor, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, Prague
Mr. Michael RICHTSTEIG	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. Hans-Christian Frhr.von REIBNITZ	Counsellor, Desk Officer Economic Dimension, German Federal Foreign Office, Berlin
Mr. Harold NEITZEL	Desk Officer, German Federal Ministry of the Environment, Berlin
Mr. Bernd GRUSCHINSKI	Desk Officer Reform States, German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation, Bonn
Mr. Raimund OLBRECHT	Second Secretary, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, Prague
Mr. Eileen PETZOLD-BRADLEY	Consultant, NGO Ecologic
Mr. Gerald C. IMMLER	Manager International Relations, Alcatel Germany

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. Patrick MULLOY	Head of Delegation, Assistant Secretary Department of Commerce
Mr. Gary VEST	Deputy Assistant Under-Secretary, Department of Defense
Mr. Charles LUDOLPH	Deputy Assistant Secretary Department of Commerce
Mr. Josiah ROSENBLATT	Deputy Chief of Mission, USOSCE, Vienna
Mr. Oscar DeSOTO	Political Deputy, USOSCE Vienna
Ms. Marlene KAUFMAN	Counsel, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
Mr. Chris CAMPONOVO	Legal Advisor's Office, U.S. Department of State
Ms. Beth JONES	Senior Advisor, U.S. Anticorruption Initiative, US Agency for International Development
Mr. Sherman HINSON	Senior Advisor, International Narcotics and Law Enforcement, U.S. Department of State
Mr. Mike KORIN	Program Manager, US Agency for International Development
Ms. Christine LUCYK	Senior Policy Advisor, Department of Commerce
Ms. Laurie MOLNAR	Central Europe Desk, Department of Commerce
Ms. Lea SWANSON	Senior Regional Advisor Environment and Energy Office, Agency for International Development, Budapest
Ms. Susan CLARK-SESTAK	Research Analyst, Institute for Defense Analysis
Mr. John FAWCETT	Public Member, International Crisis Group
Mr. Robert SCOTT	OSCE Desk Officer, Department of State

ANDORRA

ARMENIA

Mr. Jivan TABIBIAN	Ambassador, Head of the Armenian Delegation to the OSCE
Mr. Harutiun PAMBUKYAN	Deputy of the National Assembly, Member of the Standing Committee on Financial, Budgetary and Economic Issues

Ms. Dziunik AGHAJANIAN	Head of Information Monitoring Division, Policy Planning Department, MFA Armenia
Mr. Varuzhan NERSESSIAN	Second Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Armenia to the OSCE
Mr. Ashot KHURSHUDIAN	Expert, International Center for Human Rights Development

AUSTRIA

Dr. Eva NOWOTNY	Chairperson, Ambassador, Director-General for European Integration and Economic Affairs
Dr. Elke ATZLER	Minister, Permanent Mission of Austria to the OSCE (Economic Dimension)
Dr. Irene FREUDENSCHUSS-REICHL	Ambassador, Resident Representative to the IAEA, Permanent Representative to the United Nations (Vienna), UNIDO and CTBTO
Dr. Hans Peter MANZ	Director, Head of Department of International co-operation on internal security and passenger traffic including abatement of drugs and crime, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Dr. Hans-Peter GLANZER	Minister-Counsellor, Deputy, Permanent Mission of Austria to the OSCE
Mr. Hans-Michael PLUT	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Austria to the OSCE
Mag. Christian MANDL	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Austria to the OSCE (Economic Dimension)

AZERBAIJAN

Mr. Fikrat PASHAYEV	Head of Division, Department of the International Economic Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Elmir ABDULLAYEV	Planning Manager, Agency for rehabilitation and reconstruction of areas, Cabinet of Ministers
Mr. Qalib ISRAFILOV	Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. Vusal RAJABLI	Chairman of the non-governmental humanitarian organization "Xayat"

BELARUS

Mr. Andrei TUR	Deputy Minister of Economy of the Republic of Belarus
Mrs. Irina EGOROVA	Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus
Mrs. Svetlana BUTKO	Deputy Head of Division, Chernobyl State Committee
Mr. Uladyimir BELSKI	Ambassador of Belarus to the Czech Republic
Mr. Nikolai SARVIROV	Counsellor, Embassy of Belarus, Prague
Mr. Sergei LEVSHUNOV	
Representatives of NGO's	
Mr. Alexei NESTERENKO	Non-governmental Republic organization "Ecoline"
Mr. Alexander YURKEVICH	Director of Research and Development School

BELGIUM

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mrs. Sanja LJUBICIC	Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Sociology – Faculty of Criminal Sciences
Mrs. Novka AGIC	Deputy Director of PHI
Mr. Vojislav DIMITRIJEVIC	

BULGARIA

Mr. Ivan NAJDENOV	Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to the UN, OSCE and Other International Organizations, Vienna
Mr. Bogdan KOLAROV	Chief Expert, European Integration Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mrs. Teodora MITOVA	Expert, Ministry of Economy
Mr. Velislav DOBREV	Director, International Relations Department, Ministry of Transport and Telecommunication

CANADA

Mr. Henry LOTIN	First Secretary, Canadian Delegation to the OSCE
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------

CYPRUS

Mr. George VYRIDES	Ambassador
Mr. Nicos PANAYI	First Secretary

CROATIA

Mr. Mario NOBILO
Ambassador, Head of the Permanent
Mission of the Republic of Croatia to the
OSCE

DENMARK

Mr. Ulrik HELWEG-LARSEN
Ambassador of Denmark to the Czech
Republic, Head of Delegation
Mr. Tim MONDOF
Head of Section, Royal Danish Ministry
of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Johan SØRENSEN
Head of Section, Royal Danish Ministry
of Foreign Affairs
Ms. Rikke THAGESEN
First Secretary of the Delegation of
Denmark to the OSCE

SPAIN

Mr. Fernando De GALAINENA
Mr. Alvaro de SALAS
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Madrid
Counsellor, Permanent Mission to the
OSCE, Vienna
Mr. D. Antonio GÓMEZ-CRESPO
Economic Counsellor, Spanish Embassy,
Prague

ESTONIA

Ms. Tiina INTELMANN
Ambassador, Permanent Representative,
Permanent Mission of Estonia to the
OSCE
Mr. Märt VOLMER
Deputy Permanent Representative,
Permanent Mission of Estonia to the
OSCE
Ms. Maija TASA-AUN
Division of International Cupertino,
External Economic Policy Department,
MFA of Estonia
Mr. Kristjan AAVIK
Third Division (Russia and other CIS
countries), External Economic Policy
Department, MFA of Estonia

FINLAND

Mr. Pekka KUJASALO
Ambassador, Permanent OSCE Mission
in Vienna, Head of Delegation
Ms. Sanna HALINEN
First Secretary, MFA

FRANCE

Mr. Harvé LADSOUS
Ambassador, Permanent Representative
of France to the OSCE, Vienna

Mr. Jean-Pierre LACROIX
Mr. Jacques LE GUILLOU

Counsellor
Deputy Head of the French Trade
Commission

GEORGIA

Mr. Irakli MACHAVARIANI

Personal representative of the President
of Georgia on political problems of
national security and conflict resolution

Mr. Levan MIKELADZE

Ambassador, Head of the Permanent
Mission of Georgia to the OSCE

Mr. Zurab LOMASHVILI

Minister-Counsellor, Deputy Head of the
Permanent Mission of Georgia to the
OSCE

Mr. David ZALKALIANI

Counsellor, Permanent Mission of
Georgia to the OSCE

Mr. Merab GVINADZE

Attaché, Permanent Mission of Georgia
to the OSCE

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Alan HUCKLE

Head of the OSCE/COE Department,
Foreign and Commonwealth Office,
London

Mr. Douglas CHALMERS

GREECE

Mr. Constantine PREVEDOURAKIS

Ambassador, Permanent Representative
of Greece to the OSCE, Head of
Delegation

Dr. Dimitris MOSCHOPOULOS

Counsellor, Head of the OSCE Section,
MFA

Ms. Elli FRANGAKI

Athens Chamber of Commerce and
Industry

HUNGARY

Mrs. Éva SIPOS

Head of Department, Ministry of Foreign
Affairs

Mr. Zoltán LUPTÁK

Second Secretary, Hungarian Embassy,
Prague

Mr. Tibor VARGA

Counsellor, Economic and Commercial
Section of the Hungarian Embassy,
Prague

IRELAND

Mr. Brendan McMAHON
Mr. Michael FORBES

Ambassador
Department of Foreign Affairs, Dublin

Mr. James O'CONNELL Embassy of Ireland, Prague

ICELAND

Mr. Thordur Aegir OSKARSSON Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the Icelandic Mission

ITALY

Mr. Gianluigi MASCIA Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Head of OSCE Department

Ms. Emanuela D'ALESSANDRO Italian Mission to the OSCE

Ing. Giuseppe MARESCA Ministry of Environment

Ms. Adriana SALVAGNI ENI, external relations

KAZAKHSTAN

Mr. Adil ACHMETOV First Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Bulat ABILOV Parliamentarian, Member of Economic Reform Committee

Mr. Murat MUSSATAYEV Deputy Minister, Ministry of Environment

Mr. Sovetkali KARTBAYEV Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the Czech Republic

Prof. Dr. Sheripzan M. NADYROV Head of Economic Security Department, Institute for Strategic Studies under President of Kazakstan

Mr. Ildar DAURANOV Director of Business Centre, Institute of Economic Research under Ministry of Energy, Trade and Industry

Mr. Alnur JUMANBEKOV Third Secretary of the Embassy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the Czech Republic

KYRGYZSTAN

Mr. Askar BESHIMOV Director of Department of Strategic Problems and Information, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic

Mr. Kaltash BATYRKANOV Chief of the Department of Water Resources, Ministry of Agriculture and Water Economy

Mr. Yuruslan TOICHUBEKOV First Deputy Head of State

Administration of Batken Region

Mr. Bolot MUKASHEV Chief of Foreign Department of the Apparatus, Prime Minister's Apparatus

Mr. Boris PERFILIEV President, Chamber of Trade and Commerce of Kyrgyzstan

Mr. Bazarbai MAMBETOV

Kyrgyzstan Representative in the
Executive Board of the Interstate Council
of the Central Asian Economic Union

LATVIA

Mr. Igor APOKINS

Deputy Head of the Embassy of Latvia,
Prague

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Mr. Lambe ARNAUDOVSKI

Deputy Minister of Economy

Mr. Marjan DODOVSKI

Deputy Minister of Environmental

Ms. Metodija DIMOVSKI

Assistant Minister of Environmental

Mr. Bajram POLOZANI

Counsellor at the Ministry of Justice

Mr. Stefan NIKOLOVSKI

Mr. Nazif DZAFERI

Second Secretary, Ministry of Foreign
Affairs, Skopje

LIECHTENSTEIN

Ms. Karin LINGG

Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of
the Principality of Liechtenstein to the
OSCE

LITHUANIA

LUXEMBOURG

Mr. Pierre FERRING

First Secretary, Permanent Mission to the
OSCE, Vienna

MALTA

Mr. Mario BUTTIGIEG

Counsellor, Deputy Head of Delegation
to the OSCE, Vienna

MOLDOVA

Mr. Adrian SEVEROVAN

First Secretary of the International
Economic Organisations Department,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

MONACO

Mr. Jean GREThER

Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the
OSCE

NORWAY

Mr. Kai EIDE	Ambassador, Permanent Delegation of Norway to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. Helge YSTGAARD	Minister Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of Norway to the OSCE, Vienna
Ms. Kathrine RATH	Second Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Norway to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. Frode Overland ANDERSEN	Executive Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

UZBEKISTAN

Mr. Ravshan ABDULLAEV	ADJ
Mr. Ozol MUKHAMEDJANOV	LEEP
Mr. Yusup KAMALOV	
Mr. Dalbar AKHMEDOV	BWA Business Women Association

NETHERLANDS

Mr. H. NIJENHUIS	dep. HoM Netherlands, Permanent Representation to the OSCE, Vienna
Ms. D. BERGSMA	OSCE Co-ordinator, Security Policy Department, MoFA, The Hague
Mr. R. J. van HOUTUM	Ambassador of the Netherlands to the Czech Republic

POLAND

Dr. Jan BIELAWSKI	Head of the Delegation, Director of Economic Analysis Department, MFA
Dr. Jan NOWICKI	Minister-Counsellor, Department of Economic Analysis, MFA
Mr. Wojciech FLERA	Counsellor, Permanent Mission to the OSCE, Vienna

PORTUGAL/EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. Paulo RUFINO	Head of Delegation, Deputy Head of Delegation of Portugal to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. Manuel CALDEIRINHA	Deputy Head of Economic Department, MFA, Portugal
	* * *
Mr. Marc FRANCO	Director, Directorate General for Regional Policy
Mr. Timo MÄKELÄ	Head of Unit, International Policy, Directorate General for Environment

Mr. Erwan FOUÉRE	Head of the OSCE Section, Directorate General for External Relations (Head of Delegation)
Mr. Kyriakos REVELAS	OSCE Section, Directorate General for External Relations
Mr. Keith SANGWAY	OSCE Section, Directorate General for External Relations

ROMANIA

Mr. Mihail DOBRE	Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Liviu BOTA	Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Romania at the OSCE
Mr. Marian BUHOARĂ	Ambassador, the OSCE Mission in Dushanbe
Mr. Victor MICULA	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Romania at the OSCE
Mr. Gabriel LEONTE	Attaché, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mrs. Daniela PÂRVULESCU	Governmental Advisor, Council for Economic and Financial Coordination, Office for Relations with the NGO's
Mr. Ioan JELEV	Director General
Mr. Nicolae VULPĂȘIN	Ambassador, Embassy of Romania, Prague
Mr. Vasile BUGA	Counsellor, Embassy of Romania, Prague
Mr. George DIACONESCU	First Secretary, Embassy of Romania, Prague
Mr. Bogdan FILIP	Third Secretary, Embassy of Romania, Prague

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. A. N. ALEXEEV	Deputy Director of the Department, MFA of the Russian Federation, Head of Delegation
Mr. A. V. PIROGOV	Deputy Director of the Department, MFA of the Russian Federation
Mr. O. E. LUSHNIKOV	Minister-Counsellor, Embassy of the Russian Federation to the Czech Republic
Mr. I. B. SEVASTIANOV	Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the OSCE, Vienna
Mr. S. A. DOBUDKO	Counsellor, MFA of the Russian Federation
Mr. V. V. SHANIN	Counsellor, Embassy of the Russian Federation to the Czech Republic
Mr. A. V. KUZNECOV	Second Secretary, Embassy of the Russian Federation to the Czech Republic

SAN MARINO

Ms. Federica BIGI Deputy Permanent Representative to the
UN in Geneva

HOLY SEE

Monsignor Ivan JURKOVIČ Counsellor, Secretariat of State, Section
for the Holy See's Relations with States

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Mr. Anton PINTER Ambassador, Head of Permanent Mission
of the Slovak Republic to the OSCE
Mr. Ivan TIRPÁK Director General, Division of
Intersectoral Relations and Informatics,
Ministry of Environment of the Slovak
Republic
Mr. Jozef CHOVAN Deputy Director, Department of OECD
and International Organisations, Ministry
of Economy of the Slovak Republic
Mr. Juraj SÝKORA Department of International Economic
Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Slovak Republic

SLOVENIA

Mr. Roman KIRN State Undersecretary
Mr. Tilen PEČE Ministry of Economic Relations and
Development, Counsellor to the
Government

SWEDEN

Mr. Anders RÖNQUIST Deputy Director, Ministry of Foreign
Affairs, Stockholm
Ms. Ann Marie BOLIN PENNEGÅRD Minister and Deputy Head of the
Permanent Delegation of Sweden to the
OSCE, Vienna

SWITZERLAND

Mr. Jörg REDING Ambassador, Head of Delegation, State
Secretariat for Economic Affairs, Federal
Department for Economic Affairs, Berne
Mr. Remo GAUTSCHI Vice Director of the Swiss Agency for
Development and Cooperation Federal
Department for Foreign Affairs, Berne
Mr. Josef AREGGER Minister, Swiss Delegation to the OSCE,
Vienna

Ms. Siri WALT	Diplomatic collaborator, Federal Department for Foreign Affairs, Berne
Mr. Matthias AMANN	Scientific collaborator, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, Federal Department for Economic Affairs, Berne
Mr. Maurizio CERRATTI	Desk Officer, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, Federal Department for Economic Affairs, Berne

TAJKISTAN

H.E. Mr. Emomali RAKHMONOV	President of the Republic of Tajikistan, Head of Delegation
Mr. Sadamir ZUKHUROV	Deputy Prime-Minister of the Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. Talbak NAZAROV	Minister for Foreign Affairs, Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. Khamrokhon ZARIPOV	Ambassador of the Republic of Turkmenistan in Austria
Mr. Karim YULDASHEV	State Adviser of the President of the Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. Soliev HAKIM	Chairman of Trade Committee, Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. Saif RAKHIMOV	Chairman of the TV and Broadcast Committee
Mr. Rustam NAZAROV	Director of Drug Control Agency of the Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. Abdurakhom AZIMOV	Member of the Parliament of the Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. S. ISROILOV	Member of the Parliament of the Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. A. ERMATOV	Member of the Parliament of the Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. Z. ZUBAIDOV	Chief of the Protocol of the MFA, Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. B. BOBOKHONOV	Chief of MFA Department, Republic of Tajikistan
Ms. M. KAMALOVA	Attaché of the Embassy of the Republic of Tajikistan in Austria
Mr. Z. SAIDOV	Press Secretary of the President of the Republic of Tajikistan
Mr. R. BOLTUEV	Trade Representative in Czech Republic

CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr. Zdeněk MATĚJKA	Head of Delegation Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Jindřich TOMÁŠ	Deputy Minister of Defence
Dr. Jiří HLAVÁČEK	Deputy Minister of Environment

Mr. Dušan ŠTRAUCH	Chairman of the Administration of State Material Reserves
Mr. Pavel VACEK	Ambassador to the Permanent Mission to the OSCE, UN and Other International Organizations in Vienna
Mr. Miroslav BENEŠ	Member of Parliament, Permanent Delegation to the OSCE, Parliamentary Assembly
Mr. Václav EXNER	Member of Parliament, Permanent Delegation to the OSCE, Parliamentary Assembly
Mr. Jaroslav PÍŠA	Director-General of the Information and Crisis Management Section, Ministry of Trade and Industry
Mr. Alexander SLABÝ	Acting Director General of the Multilateral Relations Section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Petr MOOZ	Director of the Security Policy Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Petr SOUKUP	Ministry of Trade and Industry
Mr. Jan VONDRÁČEK	Ministry of Trade and Industry
Mr. Oldřich PRUŠA	Ministry of Trade and Industry
Mr. Peter BYSTERSKÝ	Administration of State Material Reserves
Mr. Vladimír ŠÁL	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Zdeněk FAJKUS	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Vladimír BÄRTL	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Jozef ŠPÁNIK	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Petr KAISER	Permanent Mission to the OSCE, UN and Other International Organizations, Vienna
Mr. Ota MOJŽÍŠ	Ministry of Defence
Mrs. Jana ŠILHANOVÁ	Ministry of Health, Director, Department of International Relations
Mr. Jaroslav ROTBAUER	Ministry of Health, Deputy Director, Department of International Relations
Mr. Ondřej WAGNER	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Ladislav KYLAR	Ministry of Regional Development
Mrs. Olga BENDÍKOVÁ	Department of International Relations, Office of the Chamber of Deputies, Parliament
Mr. Tomáš POJAR	People in Need Foundation, President
Mr. Šimon PÁNEK	People in Need Foundation, Director of the Board
Mr. Jiří PROCHÁZKA	Czech Red Cross, Director
Mr. Josef KONEČNÝ	Czech Red Cross
Mr. Tomáš JIRSA	Mayor, Hluboká nad Vltavou
Mr. Petr HALAXA	UNDP, National Project Manager
Mr. Jan KROUŽEK	UNDP, National Project Co-ordinator

Mr. Jan PECHÁČEK
Adviser to the Deputy Minister of
Foreign Affairs

TURKMENISTAN

Mr. Serdar BAIRIEV
Deputy Minister of Economy and
Finances of Turkmenistan

Mr. Deniyaz JAPAROV
Chief of Department, Central Bank of
Turkmenistan

Mr. Batyr BERDYEV
Head of delegation of Turkmenistan to
the OSCE

Mr. Bekmurad ASTANAKULOV
First Secretary, delegation of
Turkmenistan to the OSCE

Mr. Vyacheslav MAMEDOV
Member of Ecologic Club Flamingo
(NGO)

Mr. Farid TUHBATULLIN
Co-chairman, Dashoguz Ecologic Club
(NGO)

Mr. Andrey ARANBAEV
Co-chairman of Ecologic Club Catena
(NGO)

TURKEY

Mr. Murhat ADALI
Deputy Chief of Mission to the OSCE,
Vienna

Ms. Ceren YAZGAN-ETIZ.
Second Secretary, Permanent Mission to
the OSCE, Vienna

UKRAINE

Mr. Serhii Ivanovich USTYCH
Ambassador of Ukraine to the Czech
Republic

Mr. Olexander YUROV
Counsellor, Embassy of Ukraine, Prague

PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

JAPAN

Mr. Hiroto ISHIDA
Ambassador, Embassy of Japan, Prague

Mr. Toshihiro ARAKI
Counsellor, Embassy of Japan, Prague

Mr. Nobutaka MAEKAWA
First Secretary, Embassy of Japan,
Vienna

Mr. Akira SUZUKI
First Secretary, Embassy of Japan,
Prague

Mr. Susumu KUWAHARA
First Secretary, Embassy of Japan,
Prague

Ms. Sayo OYAGI
Attaché, Embassy of Japan, Prague

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. Tae-Chul CHUNG	Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Korea, Vienna
Mr. Sung-Chul KIM	Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Korea, Prague

MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

ALGERIA

Mr. Mohamed ALEM	First Counsellor, Embassy of Algeria, Prague
------------------	----------------------------------------------

EGYPT

Mrs. Sanaa ATALLAH	Counsellor, Embassy of Egypt, Prague
--------------------	--------------------------------------

ISRAEL

JORDAN

Dr. Malek TWAL	Deputy Chief of Mission, Vienna
----------------	---------------------------------

MOROCCO

Dr. Abdeslam OUAZZANI	Ambassador, Embassy of Kingdom of Morocco, Prague
Mr. Omar HASNAOUI	Counsellor, Embassy of Kingdom of Morocco, Prague

TUNISIA

Mr. Mondher MAMI	Ambassador, Embassy of Tunisia, Prague, Head of Delegation
Mr. Rahmouni IMED	Counsellor, Member of Delegation

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. Géza MEZEI	
Ms. Elena POPTODOROVA	
Mr. Ludovico AIGROT	
Mr. Pavel CHEVTCHENKO	Co-Secretary, Committee on Environment, Regional Planning and Local Authorities

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Christopher CVIIC

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

Mr. Meinrad STUDER Head of Sector International
Organizations Division

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

Ms. Eugenia DATE-BAH Director

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. Daniel GEORGE Director of Economic Affairs

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

Mr. Yves BERTHELOT Executive Secretary
Ms. Danuta HÜBNER
Mr. Geoffrey HAMILTON

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMME

Mr. Pekka HAAVISTO
Mr. Jernej STRITIH Regional Environmental Centre for CEE

UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

Mr. Pierre-Francois PIRLOT Deputy Director
Mr. Hans F. SCHODDER Liaison Officer
Mr Jean-Claude CONCOLATO Representative

THE WORLD BANK

Mr. Rory O'SULLIVAN
Mr. David PEARCE

* * *

BLACK SEA ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION

Mr. Vasil BAYTCHEV

COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES

Mr. Simon CHERKEZISHVILI

SOUTHEAST EUROPEAN COOPERATIVE INITIATIVE

Ms. Vera M. BUDWAY Assistant Co-ordinator

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

EUROPEAN STRATEGIC PLANNING FEDERATION

Mr. Claude POTELLE

ASSOCIATION OF ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Leonid ZLOTNIKOV Executive Director

ANALYTICAL ECONOMICAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Leonid ZLOTNIKOV

CENTRE "STRATEGY"

Mr. Sergei LEVSHOUNOV Expert

UNIVERSITAET KOPENHAGEN

Univ.-Doz. Dr. Helen LIESL KRAG

ECOLOGY OF BIOSPHERE

Mr. Sestager AKNAZAROV

LEGAL INITIATIVE

Mr. Andrey V. ANDREEV

ASSOCIATION OF ENTREPRENEURS

Ms. Svetlana SHAMSUTDINOVA

REGIONAL ENTERPRISE SUPPORT CENTRE, BITOLA

Dr. Dragan DAMJANOVSKI

MINORITY RIGHTS GROUP INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Miles LITVINOFF Head of Programmes

INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF FREE TRADE UNIONS

Mr. Jürgen BUXBAUM Director South-East Europe Office

* * *

OTHERS

Mr. Tome GAGACHEV Businessman

OSCE MISSIONS AND FIELD ACTIVITIES

OSCE LIAISON OFFICE IN CENTRAL ASIA

Mr. Gantcho GANTCHEV Head of Liaison Office
Mr. Jakub ROSHAN

OSCE PRESENCE IN ALBANIA

Mr. Geert-Hinrich AHRENS Ambassador, Head of Presence

OSCE CENTRE IN ALMATY

Mr. Ulrich SCHONING Ambassador, Head of Centre

Mr. Asim ACIKEL

OSCE CENTRE IN ASHGABAD

Ms. Bess BROWN
Mr. Riccardo LEPRI

OSCE CENTRE IN BISHKEK

Mr. Markku VISAPÄÄ

OSCE MISSION TO BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Ms. Marina COBLENTZ

OSCE MISSION TO CROATIA

Mr. Axel JAENICKE Head of Return and Integration Unit

OSCE MISSION TO GEORGIA

Mr. Jean-Michel LACOMBE Head of Mission
Mr. Hans-Georg HEINRICH Economic Counsellor
Mr. Klaus RASMUSSEN Political Counsellor

OSCE MISSION TO TAJIKISTAN

Mr. Marin BUHOARA Head of Mission

OSCE MISSION TO YEREVAN

Mr. Frank EVERS Economic and Environmental Adviser

OSCE SECRETARIAT

Mr. Ján KUBIŠ	Secretary General
Mr. Thomas PRICE	Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
Mr. Fredrik SCHILLER	Head/Mission Liaison Section
Mr. Marc BALTES	Senior Economic Adviser
Mr. Raine HERMANN	Assistant to the Personal Representative of the CiO for Central Asia
Mr. Janne HEISKANEN	Environmental Adviser
Mr. Zdeněk VENERA	Head of the Prague Office
Mr. Mans NYBERG	Press Officer

OSCE REPRESENTATIVE ON FREEDOM OF THE MEDIA

Ms. Hanna VUOKKO Adviser

ODIHR

Ms. Lara GRIFFITH Gender Mainstreaming and the Human Rights of Woman Adviser

CONFERENCE SERVICES

Mr. Gunther NEUMANN	Deputy Director
Mr. Andrey GROSHEV	Chief, Language Services
Mr. Knut KIRSTE	Chief, Meeting Assistance Unit
Ms. Cynthia BRADY	Senior Meeting Assistant
Ms. Sabine CHORHERR	Language Services Senior Assistant
Ms. Fay Ann GAUSTER	Supervisor, Text Control and Processing Unit
Ms. Elke LIDARIK	Supervisor, Meetings Support and Documents Unit
Mr. Marc VAN-EMDEN	Word Processing Operator
Ms. Karin SCHEYRER	Meetings Support and Documents Unit
Ms. Martina HAYDN	Meetings Support and Documents Unit



**Log of Contributions to the Eighth Meeting of the Economic Forum
Prague, 11-14 April 2000**

**Theme: Economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation:
the challenges of transformation**

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
I. Plenary sessions				
EF.DEL/1/00	05.04.00	UN/ECE	Statement: The challenge of managing diversity and confronting divergence in OSCE	E
EF.DEL/4/00	11.04.00	Czech Republic	Report by Mr. Matejka, Secretary General of the Czech Ministry for Foreign Affairs	E
EF.DEL/5/00	11.04.00	Austria	Statement by Ambassador Nowotny, Chairperson of the Forum	E
EF.DEL/6/00	11.04.00	European Commission	Statement on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	E
EF.DEL/6/00/Add.1	11.04.00	European Commission	Annex to the statement on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	E
EF.DEL/7/00	11.04.00	Switzerland	Statement by the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	F
EF.DEL/8/00	11.04.00	Romania	Statement by Mr. M. Dobre at the opening plenary	E
EF.DEL/9/00	11.04.00	USA	Statement by Mr. Rosenblatt on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	E
EF.DEL/10/00	12.04.00	OCEEA	Speaking notes for the CEEA, Mr. Tom Price	E
EF.DEL/11/00	12.04.00	Tajikistan	Statement at the opening plenary by the President of Tajikistan	E/R
EF.DEL/12/00	12.04.00	Denmark	Statement by Ambassador Larsen on effective post-conflict rehabilitation	E
EF.DEL/13/00	12.04.00	BSEC	Presentation by the Black Sea Economic Cooperation on economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation	E
EF.DEL/14/00	12.04.00	Turkey	Statement by Mr. P. Malloy on the role and challenges of the OSCE	E
EF.DEL/17/00	12.04.00	Turkmenistan	Statement on the role and challenges of the OSCE	E/R
EF.DEL/18/00	12.04.00	Russian Federation	Statement on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	E/R
EF.DEL/20/00	12.04.00	Switzerland	Statement by Mr. P. Malloy on the economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation	F
EF.DEL/21/00	12.04.00	USA	Statement on the economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation	E

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
EF.DEL/23/00	12.04.00	Belarus	Statement on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	E/R
EF.DEL/24/00	12.04.00	Liechtenstein	Statement on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	E/G
EF.DEL/25/00	12.04.00	Canada	Statement on economic aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation	E
EF.DEL/30/00	13.04.00	International Crisis Group	Statement by Mr. John Fawcett on the role and challenges of the OSCE	E
EF.DEL/32/00	13.04.00	Secretary General	Welcoming remarks	E
EF.DEL/46/00	13.04.00	European Commission	Statement by Mr. M. Franco on post-conflict rehabilitation in Kosovo and in the Western Balkans	E
EF.GAL/3/00	06.04.00	CiO	Draft agenda and work programme	E
EF.GAL/4/00	06.04.00	OCEEA	Activity Report by CEEA, Mr. Tom Price	E
EF.GAL/5/00	14.04.00	Rapporteur of WGI (USAID)	Rapporteur's report on the experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts	E
EF.GAL/6/00	14.04.00	Rapporteur of WGII (UK)	Rapporteur's report on the environmental impact of conflicts and rehabilitation measures	E
EF.GAL/7/00	14.04.00	Rapporteur of WGIII (Personal Advisor to the SG)	Rapporteur's report on the experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts	E
EF.GAL/8/00	14.04.00	Rapporteur of SSI (Romania)	Rapporteur's report on the special session on challenges of transformation: a framework for economic recovery	E
EF.GAL/9/00	14.04.00	Rapporteur of SSII (Austria)	Rapporteur's report on the special session on rule of law, good governance and the need to combat corruption	E
EF.GAL/10/00	14.04.00	Rapporteur of the Implementation Review Meeting (Turkey)	Rapporteur's report on the review of implementation of commitments in the economic dimension	E
II. Working Group I – Economic rehabilitation and next steps in the transition: institution-building, rule of law and the role of civil society				
EF.DEL/19/00	12.04.00	International Federation of Journalists	Statement by Mr. O. Money-Kyrle on the role of the media in post-conflict society	E
EF.DEL/22/00	12.04.00	Kazakhstan	Statement	E/R
EF.DEL/29/00	13.04.00	Minority Rights Group International	Statement on the integration of minorities in economic and social life	E
III. Working Group II – Environmental impact of conflicts and rehabilitation measures				
EF.DEL/26/00	12.04.00	United Kingdom	Statement on water and energy issues affecting economic performance	E
EF.DEL/36/00	13.04.00	Czech Republic	Contribution of Mr. J. Hlavacek	E
EF.DEL/40/00	13.04.00	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Address by Mr. Dodovski	E
EF.DEL/47/00	13.04.00	Germany	Statement	E
EF.DEL/49/00	13.04.00	European Commission	Statement by Mr. K. Sangway	E
IV. Working Group III – Experiences with post-conflict rehabilitation efforts				
EF.DEL/27/00	12.04.00	Azerbaijan	Statement	E/R
EF.DEL/35/00	13.04.00	Slovenia	Strategy of integration of Slovenia in the economic reconstruction of South	E

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
			Eastern Europe	
EF.DEL/37/00	13.04.00	Belarus	Statement	E (Annex: R)
EF.DEL/41/00	13.04.00	Belarus	Business plan for intensive technology based production of milk	E
EF.DEL/42/00	13.04.00	Belarus	Business plan for growing and long-term preservation of apples under conditions of the Khoiniki district and encouragement of entrepreneurship, Gomel region	E
EF.DEL/43/00	13.04.00	Belarus	Business plan for creating a mobile unit for the production of heavy crops in the joint-stock company "Agrofirm Techservice" of the Buda-Koshelevo district of the Gomel region	E
EF.DEL/44/00	13.04.00	Romania	Statement on NGO relations	F
EF.DEL/44/00 /Corr.1	13.04.00	Romania	Statement on NGO relations	F
EF.DEL/45/00	13.04.00	Belarus	Project presentation: "polytechnopolis-2000"	E
EF.DEL/50/00	13.04.00	Azerbaijan	Statement	E/R
V. Special Session I – Challenges of transformation: a framework for economic recovery				
EF.DEL/33/00	13.04.00	Slovak Republic	Statement on a national programme for fighting corruption	E
EF.DEL/34/00	13.04.00	World Bank	The road to stability and prosperity in Southeastern Europe	E
EF.DEL/38/00	13.04.00	International Labour Organisation	Some ILO ideas on a framework for economic recovery	E
EF.DEL/39/00	13.04.00	Armenia	Statement	E
EF.DEL/51/00	13.04.00	UN/ECE	Presentation by Mr. Geoffrey Hamilton	E
VI. Special Session II – Rule of law, good governance and the need to combat corruption				
EF.DEL/33/00	13.03.00	Slovak Republic	National programme for the fight against corruption (draft version)	E
EF.DEL/52/00	14.04.00	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Statement	E
EF.DEL/53/00	14.04.00	USA	Statement by S. E. Jones (USAID)	E
EF.DEL/55/00	14.04.00	Romania	Statement	E
EF.DEL/57/00	14.04.00	Canada	Statement	E
VII. Other relevant documents				
EF.DEL/2/00	11.04.00	Czech Republic	Report by the Secretary General of the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the present situation concerning investment climate and development of the market economy in the Czech Republic	E
EF.DEL/3/00	11.04.00	SECI	Activity report	E
EF.DEL/15/00	12.04.00	European Business Congress	Statement on the role and challenges of the OSCE	E
EF.DEL/16/00	12.04.00	SECI	SECI Regional Center for the combating of transborder crime	E
EF.DEL/28/00	11.04.00	Czech Republic	Statement on the review of the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension – written reply to Liechtenstein	E
EF.DEL/31/00	12.04.00	Czech Republic	Information on the involvement of the Czech Republic in the process of reconstruction and stabilization in the	E

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
			Balkan region	
EF.DEL/48/00	13.04.00	Czech Republic	The Czech Republic and the European Union	E
EF.DEL/54/00	14.04.00	European Commission	Background paper: Statement by Mr. C. Patten, European Commissioner responsible for external relations	E
EF.DEL/56/00	14.04.00	Greece	Statement by Ambassador Prevedourakis at the closing plenary (written)	E
EF.FR/1/00	14.04.00	Secretary General	Collection of Mission reports relating to the Human Dimension	E
EF.GAL/1/00	08.03.00	CiO	Draft working agenda	E
EF.GAL/1/00/ Rev.1	04.04.00	CiO	Revised draft working agenda	E
EF.GAL/1/00/ Rev.2	07.04.00	CiO	Revised draft working agenda	E
EF.GAL/2/00	31.03.00	CiO	Draft organization of the working groups	E
EF.GAL/2/00/ Rev.1	07.04.00	CiO	Draft organization of the working groups	E
EF.INF/1/00	11.04.00	Conference Services	Provisional List of Participants	E
EF.INF/1/00/ Rev.1	13.04.00	Conference Services	Final List of Participants	E
PC.DD/7/00	02.02.00	CiO	Draft Decision on the main subjects and organizational modalities for the 8th Meeting of the Economic Forum	E
PC.DEC/340	10.02.00	CiO	PC Decision on the main subjects and organizational modalities for the 8th Meeting of the Economic Forum	E
PC.DEL/153/ 00	16.03.00	CiO	Information on the 8th Meeting of the Economic Forum presented by the Chairperson of the Forum	E
SEC.INF/143/ 00	15.03.00	Press and Public Information	Press release	E
SEC.INF/144/ 00	16.03.00	Conference Services	Modalities for the 8th Meeting of the Economic Forum	E
SEC.INF/192/ 00	05.04.00	Press and Public Information	Press advisory	E