



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

FSC.AIAM/23/08
11 March 2008

ENGLISH only

Conference Services

EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING

Vienna, 4 and 5 March 2008

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY

REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Decision No. 5/07 on the dates and venue of the Eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	1
Decision No. 7/07 on the agenda and modalities of the Eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	2
Decision No. 8/07 on the meeting of the heads of verification centres at the Eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	6
Annotated agenda and indicative timetable of the Eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	8
Opening session	
Director's report on the work of the Conflict Prevention Centre in support of the Forum for Security Co-operation.....	13
Final report on the meeting of heads of verification centres at the Eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	16
Reports of the working session rapporteurs	
Working session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions	23
Working session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions (continued)	27
Working session 2: Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: Clarification, assessment and conclusions	32
Working session 3: Suggestions aimed at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs	37
Chairperson's report	
Report to the Forum for Security Co-operation on the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting by the chairperson of the closing session	41



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

FSC.DEC/5/07

14 March 2007

Original: ENGLISH

27th Joint Meeting of the FSC and the PC

FSC-PC Journal No. 14, Agenda item 5

**DECISION No. 5/07
DATES AND VENUE OF THE EIGHTEENTH
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING**

The Forum for Security Co-operation,

Decides that the eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) will be held on 4 and 5 March 2008 in Vienna.



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

FSC.DEC/7/07
13 June 2007

Original: ENGLISH

517th Plenary Meeting

FSC Journal No. 523, Agenda item 3

DECISION No. 7/07
AGENDA AND MODALITIES OF THE EIGHTEENTH
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING

4 and 5 March 2008

Vienna Document 1999:

- (148) *The participating States will hold each year a meeting to discuss the present and future implementation of agreed CSBMs. Discussion may extend to:*
- (148.1) — *Clarification of questions arising from such implementation;*
- (148.2) — *Operation of agreed measures, including the use of additional equipment during inspections and evaluation visits;*
- (148.3) — *Implications of all information originating from the implementation of any agreed measures for the process of confidence- and security-building in the framework of the OSCE.*
- (150) *The Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) will hold such meetings. It will consider, as required, suggestions made during the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs.*

I. Agenda and indicative timetable

Tuesday, 4 March 2008

- 10–10.45 a.m. Opening session
- Opening of the meeting by the Chairperson;
 - Remarks by the Chairperson of the FSC;
 - Presentation of a summary report by the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC);
 - Presentation of the report by the CPC on the meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres.

- 11 a.m.–6 p.m. Working session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI): Clarification, assessment and conclusions
- Vienna Document 1999:
 - Annual exchange of military information;
 - Defence planning;
 - Risk reduction;
 - Military activities:
 - (i) Prior notification of certain military activities;
 - (ii) Annual calendars;
 - (iii) Constraining provisions;
 - (iv) Observation of certain military activities;
 - Contacts;
 - Evaluation;
 - Inspection;
 - Regional measures;
 - Communications Network;
 - GEMI.
- 1–3 p.m. Lunch break
- 3–6 p.m. Working session 1 (continued)

Wednesday, 5 March 2008

- 10 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session 2: Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: Clarification, assessment and conclusions
- Principles governing conventional arms transfers;
 - Principles governing non-proliferation;
 - Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations;
 - Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines;
 - Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security;
 - OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW);
 - OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition;
 - Principles for export controls of MANPADS;
 - Principles on the control of brokering in SALW;
 - Standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports.
- 1–3 p.m. Lunch break
- 3–4.30 p.m. Working session 3: Suggestions aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs

5–6 p.m. Closing session

- Working session reports;
- Discussion;
- Concluding remarks;
- Agenda and dates of the 2009 AIAM;
- Closure.

II. Organizational modalities

1. The AIAM will last two days and will have opening and closing sessions, as well as working sessions, dealing with the topics contained in the agenda (I). The indicative timetable provides more detail.

2. The organizational meeting of chairpersons, co-ordinators, rapporteurs, and the CPC will be held on 3 March 2008 at 3 p.m.

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

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

4. The sessions will be chaired by representatives of the participating States, in rotation, in accordance with the French alphabetical order, following on from the chairing of the closing plenary meeting of the 2007 AIAM by Belarus. The chair of the opening session and working sessions will be held by Belgium. The chair of the closing session will be held by Bosnia and Herzegovina.

5. Debates in the working sessions will be oriented towards problems and solutions and there will be no formal statements. Any national statements for the opening session should be presented in written form only and are to be distributed in advance. The working sessions are designed to be very informal meetings of national experts with the objectives of answering questions, exchanging information and allowing for constructive debate between participating States. Delegations are strongly encouraged to provide detailed explanations and concrete examples of their own implementation experiences. Delegations are welcome to distribute written contributions in advance of the Meeting, both on agenda items and on related matters for possible discussion. All delegations are strongly encouraged to provide national experts to participate in the AIAM.

6. The CPC will circulate the revised Annual Survey on CSBM Information Exchanged and the AIAM Survey of Suggestions 2007, no later than 13 February 2008. By the same date, the CPC will in addition circulate a summary report on recent trends in the implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and other measures. These will serve as a basis for preparatory work by delegations and co-ordinators. In particular, the co-ordinators should focus on suggestions which might be supported by delegations.

7. Working session 1 will have two designated co-ordinators and two rapporteurs while working sessions 2 and 3 will have one co-ordinator and one rapporteur. The task of the

co-ordinators will be to facilitate the discussion, while the task of the rapporteurs will be to present an oral report to the closing session.

8. The co-ordinators will circulate a list of topics and questions for facilitating the discussion in their working sessions. They will be supported by the CPC in this regard. They will ensure that all relevant areas are addressed.

9. During the first part of the closing session, the rapporteur from each working session will give an oral report to the delegates on the issues that were addressed during the sessions. This report should include problem areas, improvements in implementation accomplished by OSCE participating States, suggestions for further improvement, and any other relevant information. Delegations are encouraged to comment on or add to the reports presented by the rapporteurs.

10. Delegations that have volunteers to act as co-ordinators or/and rapporteurs for the working sessions should provide the names of the individuals to the Chairperson of the FSC as soon as possible, but no later than 12 February 2008. The names of the co-ordinators and rapporteurs for each working session will be made known to all delegations no later than 14 February 2008.

11. During the first FSC plenary meeting following the AIAM, the Chairperson of the closing session will report on the AIAM to the FSC and provide the Chairperson's report together with the reports of the rapporteurs of the working sessions. Within a month after the AIAM the CPC will circulate a written report on suggestions made during the Meeting aimed at improving the implementation of CSBMs.

12. The approach recommended in order to ensure the most productive discussion in the FSC when the participating States consider, as required, suggestions for improvement of the implementation of CSBMs made during the Meeting, is for delegations to bring forward suggestions or topics of interest by means of food-for-thought papers. Discussions on initial papers could lead to further work in the FSC.

13. Before the conclusion of the Eighteenth AIAM, the participating States will agree upon the agenda and dates for the AIAM in 2009. Lack of agreement will not constitute sufficient reason to extend the Meeting, unless otherwise agreed. The agenda and dates may, if necessary, be agreed between Meetings.

14. The Partners for Co-operation and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly are invited to attend all sessions of the 2008 AIAM.



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

FSC.DEC/8/07

13 June 2007

Original: ENGLISH

517th Plenary Meeting

FSC Journal No. 523, Agenda item 4

DECISION No. 8/07
MEETING OF THE HEADS OF VERIFICATION
CENTRES AT THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION
ASSESSMENT MEETING

The Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC),

Reaffirming that the OSCE Vienna Document 1999 (VD99) remains a key instrument for confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) and noting that the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) provides an important venue to discuss the implementation of agreed measures under the provisions of VD99,

Recognizing the interest expressed by participating States for the organization of a Heads of Verification Centres meeting to exchange experiences and information on technical aspects of implementation,

Encouraged by the positive reaction to the dedicated session for the Heads of Verification Centres held during the seventeenth AIAM,

Recognizing the advantages to holding a Heads of Verification Centres meeting outside the framework of, but adjacent to the AIAM,

Decides:

1. To call for a meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres on the afternoon of 3 March 2008, prior to the eighteenth AIAM;
2. To task the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) to prepare and chair the meeting;
3. That the agenda for the meeting should include the following main subjects:
 - Verification-specific discussion on the implementation of CSBMs and other relevant issues between the Heads of Verification Centres;
 - Exchange of views on the accomplished verification activities of the previous year;

— Exchange of views on scheduled activities under VD99;

4. To task the CPC to report on the meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres at the opening session of the eighteenth AIAM.

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

4 and 5 March 2008

Tuesday, 4 March 2008

10–10.45 a.m. Opening session

Chairperson: Belgium (also chairing the working sessions)

- Opening of the meeting by the Chairperson;
- Remarks by the Chairperson of the FSC;
- Presentation of a summary report by the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC);
- Presentation of the report by the CPC on the meeting of the Heads of Verification Centres.

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

Co-ordinator: Mr. B. Donagh (Ireland)

Rapporteur: Mr. A. Taran (Ukraine)

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

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

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

Co-ordinator: Ms. B. Gare (United Kingdom)

Rapporteur: Ms. E. Jafarova (Azerbaijan)

- Vienna Document 1999:
 - Contacts;
 - Evaluation;
 - Inspection;

- Regional measures;
- Communications Network;
- GEMI.

Wednesday, 5 March 2008

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

Co-ordinator: Mr. V. Pavlov (Belarus)
Rapporteur: Mr. S. D. Neculaescu (Romania)

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

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

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

Co-ordinator: Mr. L. Kleinjan (Netherlands)
Rapporteur: Mr. V. Negro (Italy)

5–6 p.m. Closing session

Chairperson: Bosnia and Herzegovina

- Working session reports;
- Discussion;
- Concluding remarks;
- Agenda and dates of the 2009 AIAM;
- Closure.

OPENING SESSION

DIRECTOR'S REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE CONFLICT PREVENTION CENTRE IN SUPPORT OF THE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION

4 March 2008

Mr. Chairperson,

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to address the opening session of the Eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting. In the next few minutes, I would like to briefly present the summary report prepared by the CPC on Recent Trends in the Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Other Agreed Measures, as well as an overview of the main activities of the CPC in support of the FSC in 2007.

AIAM and other CSBM meetings

By looking through the summary report distributed as FSC.GAL/18/08 on 11 February 2008, one can easily notice that the main implementation trends outlined in the first CPC summary report to the AIAM in 2007 have generally continued. The number of submissions under most information exchanges, such as the Annual Exchange of Military Information and the Information Exchange on the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, has remained quite stable and high during the past five years. Overall, there have not been any major changes in the implementation of these CSBM measures during the past years.

Some smaller variations can, however, be detected. For example, last year 52 States submitted their replies to the Global Exchange of Military Information, which constitutes three more than in the year before. Also, only four visits to air bases and military facilities were organized in 2007, against 18 visits organized the year before. The differences in these numbers can largely be explained by the five-year period set for them in the Vienna Document. The most recent five-year period ended in 2006, and 2007 was the first year of a new five-year period. On this point, the participating States may wish to consider an even distribution of the visits over the next four years to avoid last-minute scheduling of a large number of events for 2011.

Coming to our day-to-day activities in 2007, an effective monitoring system and institutional memory retained by the FSC Support Section provided for continuing support to the FSC in reviewing the implementation of CSBMs and other commitments in the politico-military area. In line with the CPC's mandate, periodic implementation overview reports (monthly, quarterly and annual) were provided to the participating States. Following the request of delegations, we have collected and compiled a list of the FSC Chairperson's statements related to implementation aspects of the Vienna Document 1999, which will be distributed soon.

The FSC was also supported in the preparation, conduct and follow-up of the Special Meeting of Working Group A to assess the implementation of the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security that took place on 23 May 2007.

Individual assistance

Individual assistance to participating States in the implementation of their politico-military commitments remained a priority and a daily task. In response to the request from Kyrgyzstan, the CPC organized national training on the implementation of CSBMs, the preparation of information exchanges and the use of the OSCE Communications Network. Today, we are pleased to note that the recent submission of a number of information exchanges by the Kyrgyz Republic proves that the training was both effective and well received by the requesting State.

Jointly with Switzerland and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, a seminar on democratic control of armed forces was conducted in Montenegro in September. Given our continuous serious attention to the implementation of the Code of Conduct, the CPC also contributed to the national Code of Conduct workshops in Bosnia and Herzegovina, organized by the OSCE Mission in February and March 2007.

Small arms and light weapons (SALW) and stockpiles of conventional ammunition (SCA)

The next major focus of the CPC agenda was SALW and SCA. The CPC continued to be actively involved in helping participating States to meet their respective obligations and in facilitating 15 assistance projects under the OSCE assistance mechanism.

Support to the FSC

In March 2007, the CPC supported the preparation of the Special FSC Meeting on Combating the Illicit Trafficking of SALW by Air and produced a survey of suggestions. The CPC put forward an initiative on conducting a workshop on reviewing OSCE project activities on SALW and conventional ammunition. Pursuant to FSC Decision No. 13/07, preparations were made for the FSC Workshop on the Implications of Technical, Managerial and Financial Issues on Existing and Planned OSCE Projects on SALW, and SCA, including elaboration of some practical proposals aimed at facilitating the development and implementation of projects. The CPC also obtained and provided expert advice to participating States on developing best practice guides on conventional ammunition. As part of the FSC's preparations for the Ministerial Council meeting in Madrid, assistance was provided in preparing progress reports on SALW and SCA to the Ministerial Council, as well as in organizing a side event on SALW and ammunition projects.

Project implementation

Continuous assistance was provided to OSCE field operations in completing projects on mélange disposal in Armenia and clearance of unexploded ordnance in Ukraine, as well as in implementation of several tasks under Phase II of the Comprehensive SALW and Ammunition Programme for Tajikistan. Based on the Memorandum of Understanding with the United Nations Development Programme on the joint implementation of SALW and SCA projects, the CPC also helped launch joint projects on SALW stockpile management and security in Belarus and a demilitarization programme in Montenegro.

Project development

In 2007, the FSC, field operations and the Secretariat continued the development of major ammunition projects, including on the disposal of rocket fuel component (mélange). Technical and management advice was provided to the OSCE Missions in Georgia and Moldova on assessing and developing SALW and SCA projects, including a technical workshop on the OSCE assistance mechanism to improve stockpile management and destroy SALW and SCA surpluses in Moldova in September. The CPC also played a key co-ordinating role among all the stakeholders in the development of project proposals for mélange disposal in Ukraine and Kazakhstan, including negotiation of the MoUs. In the case of Ukraine, the MoU was signed by the OSCE Secretary General in July 2007, and we are looking forward to the counter-signature by Ukraine.

OSCE Communications Network

Moving to the OSCE Communications Network, I would like to mention that the FSC Support Section continued to operate and maintain the OSCE Communications Network to facilitate the implementation of numerous politico-military commitments, the Treaty on Open Skies, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) and, new in 2007, the Dayton Peace Agreement. The Communications Network team successfully managed daily network operations, oversight, troubleshooting, and assistance, as well as all technical, contractual, and financial tasks on behalf of delegations. In 2007, the Network and the custom software utilized by delegations were further upgraded through a process of continuous improvement, including the first phase of adding the Dayton Agreement to the custom software. The Network was also expanded, with Montenegro joining it, and several participating States connecting their Ministries of Defence in addition to their Ministries of Foreign Affairs. Technical training and assistance visits were conducted to Kyrgyzstan and Montenegro. Fifty of the 56 participating States are now connected. Efforts are continuing to connect the remaining States. The result is a fully modern, state-of-the-art Network that meets the needs of the participating States. During 2007, the Network was available 99.9 per cent of the time. Further upgrades will be scheduled to keep pace with technological developments.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the CPC will continue, in accordance with its mandate, to provide the required support for the FSC and its Chairmanship in their efforts to further assist the participating States. The CPC will remain the focal point for enabling the monitoring of the implementation of existing commitments and of new initiatives in the politico-military dimension of security. This includes close co-ordination with other international and regional organizations, as well as the organization of seminars and training programmes. The CPC will also continue to support and co-ordinate the activities of OSCE field missions aimed at assisting individual participating States in the implementation of their politico-military commitments, as well as address specific requests for assistance.

The CPC will follow the discussions during this meeting and provide assistance when requested. I wish you every success in your work.

Thank you for your attention.

FINAL REPORT ON THE MEETING OF HEADS OF VERIFICATION CENTRES AT THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING

3 March 2008

Executive summary

In accordance with FSC Decision No. 8/07, the second meeting of the OSCE heads of verification meeting was held on 3 March 2008. The verification centres are a vital part of the OSCE politico-military dimension. They implement the Vienna Document 1999 (VD-99) and other confidence-and security-building measures (CSBMs) as decided by the Forum for Security Co-operation. This meeting was a unique opportunity to convene the collective knowledge and expertise of participating States in implementation of such measures, and to exchange experiences and recommendations on their improvement. It thereby supported the goals of openness and transparency in the OSCE politico-military dimension.

The meeting was prepared, chaired and supported with a rapporteur by the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre. The agenda had been distributed via FSC.GAL/22/08. The following is a summary of the most important issues addressed at this meeting.

1. Verification-specific discussion on the implementation of CSBMs and other relevant issues between the heads of verification centres

Inspections and evaluations

In discussing inspections and evaluations under the VD-99, one delegation referred to the need to harmonize inspections and evaluations in order to address the problem of the “quota race” at the start of each year. It noted that the nature of inspections has changed, since there no longer are concentrations of troops that would meet the thresholds qualifying for inspections. Furthermore, inspection quotas are frequently exhausted in the beginning of the year. The delegation suggested that the participating States could agree on specific inspection schemes and make an attempt at co-ordination. This would allow for a more equal and fair distribution of quotas and give participating States the possibility to have the inspections they want at least every two to three years. The same delegation recommended that the issue of the quota race also be taken up at the FSC Working Groups. Responding to these comments, another delegation pointed out statistics from 2007 inspections and evaluations, and noted that the quota run tends to always affect the same limited number of States, and that less than half of the participating States made use of their quota in 2007. Therefore, the delegation suggested that, instead of discussing a more even distribution of quotas during the year, the possibility of adjusting the quotas should be addressed.

One delegation shared its experience in organizing inspections in 2007 and pointed out one problematic case in which the inspection was refused. No explanation for the refusal had been provided, despite several follow-ups by the requesting State and the FSC Chairmanship. The delegation called upon all participating States to engage in full implementation of the VD-99.

One delegation brought up the issue of visa procedures, specifically as they pertain to conducting VD-99 inspections/evaluations within the Schengen area by States that are not parties to the Schengen Agreement. It proposed that, in cases where a non-Schengen State intends to conduct consecutive evaluations/inspections in more than one Schengen State without leaving the Schengen area, the first host State should obtain the needed visas for the duration of stay in the entire area. This would facilitate the issuing of visas and more flexible movement of inspection/evaluation teams. A number of delegations generally supported the idea of more efficient visa procedures for the Schengen area. One delegation noted that the requesting State should travel with diplomatic passports, and clearly specify its team's origin and final destination in order to better co-ordinate the response. Another delegation gave an example of difficulties its inspection team faced recently in receiving visas during transit through the Schengen area.

Regarding inspection/evaluation requests, one delegation noted that recent experience shows that these requests are sometimes sent earlier than indicated in paragraphs 85 and 119 of the VD-99. It proposed that the FSC take a decision to enable the host State to disregard the request where it has not been made according to the VD-99 provisions (ref. FSC.AIAM/9/08).

Some delegations noted their general support for future HoV centres meetings. One delegation pointed out that, in order to achieve the desired goals, the meeting should stay at a technical and practical level and focus on incremental improvements and concrete proposals for further action. It called on all participating States to return to the fundamental principles of VD-99 as a regime invented to foster transparency and trust, and noted that it would rather be in favour of improving the implementation (through interpretation, clarification and flexibility) of its current provisions than developing additional approaches. Other delegations referred to the spirit of the VD-99 and encouraged participating States, instead of merely following the letter of each paragraph, to pay more attention to its spirit and use its flexibility — and sometimes ambiguity — in a constructive manner. Reference was made to the non-availability of helicopters during some inspections. Some delegations favoured counting interpreters as additional auxiliary personnel to facilitate the work of inspection/evaluation teams during verification activities. One delegation pointed out that it would favour an FSC decision on this issue before changing its current implementation practice. In this regard, reference was also made to the FSC Chairperson's statements from 2004.

One delegation referred to the use of guest inspectors as a successful practice, and agreed with the previous speakers that the VD-99 should be interpreted in a positive manner, wherever possible.

Regarding the notification of temporary activation of non-active formations and units, one delegation noted that it has been reporting such units as an additional transparency measure. However, since they had not been evaluated in many years and the evaluation regime is changing, it announced the cessation of such reporting, as well as the voluntary additional quota it had accepted for this purpose.

Contacts

In discussing contacts, one delegation referred to the cost implications of organizing a presentation of new weapon or equipment systems. It proposed to take an FSC decision to change the provision to hold this demonstration, not within one year, but within five years

after the equipment enters into service. This could be combined with visits to air bases and military facilities to allow this measure to be carried out also once every five years. Additionally, the delegation proposed the development of “best practice” methodologies or an instruction manual for those involved in organizing visits. This proposal was supported by another delegation.

In response, one delegation said that the current practice, i.e., combining contact visits and weapons demonstrations, is in fact what the other delegation proposed. It also called for everyone’s flexibility, following the spirit of the VD-99. Reference was made to the voluntary assistance mechanisms for those requiring assistance in organizing such visits.

Regarding military contact visits, one delegation noted that some States had not met their commitments during the last five-year period, and that participating States should help those states in training and preparing so that they do not miss the deadline during this five-year period.

Annual calendars and constraining provisions

One delegation stated that it plans to deploy approximately 9,000 troops this year and has accordingly notified other participating States. Another delegation again underlined the need for transparency in conducting activities, and made reference to the FSC Chairperson’s statement on prior notification of major military activities, reminding participating States that they could use this opportunity to notify their largest activity, even if it does not exceed the VD-99 threshold. This was supported by another delegation, which also expressed support for an FSC decision to this effect. Further, one delegation underlined the flexibility of the VD-99 and noted that it would not want to add paragraphs to make it more restrictive, but rather work to exercise practical transparency through implementation, for example by notifying the largest exercise on a voluntary basis. Another delegation pointed out that the importance of exercises can be viewed in different ways, not only by the number of troops. For example, if participating States organized new types of exercises, it would be good to notify them, as they might be of interest to other participating States.

2. Exchange of views on accomplished verification activities under the VD-99 in 2007

The Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office for Article IV of the Dayton Peace Accords gave a presentation on the use of OSCE assistants in inspections (FSC.AIAM/7/08).

Following this presentation, two delegations provided further examples of their experiences with implementing subregional CSBMs. One delegation cited annual implementation meetings, agreement on the limitation of the inspected area and the introduction of a clear structure for inspection briefings as positive examples that could be useful in other regional measures. It also referred to the spirit of the VD-99 as the guiding principle and welcomed joint training of verification personnel under Chapter X agreements.

One delegation announced two successful training courses conducted at its regional arms control centre, with more activities planned for 2008.

The Conflict Prevention Centre announced distribution of an updated overview of regional and bilateral CSBMs (FSC.GAL/32/08). Contributions for further updates were welcomed.

3. Exchange of views on scheduled activities under the VD-99 for 2008

Seven delegations announced their planned activities for the period 2008 to 2010.

Regarding the future of meetings of heads of verification centres, several delegations expressed their support to continue them. Several called for further co-ordination and preparation of such meetings. One delegation noted that this meeting was a step in the right direction, but it would want to see more concrete results. It noted that holding the meeting together with the AIAM was useful, but perhaps additional, informal preparatory meetings could be considered to allow for personal interchange and ensure practical outcomes. Another delegation favoured keeping the meeting of heads of verification centres and the AIAM linked together to ensure the transfer of the outcome of the meetings to the AIAM. One delegation pointed out that it might be useful to limit the number of agenda items to allow for a more profound discussion of fewer points. Another delegation proposed that those States that propose agenda items should also give presentations on them at the meeting. In order to allow for better preparation, one delegation proposed working groups, at longer intervals prior to the meetings of heads of verification centres, which could last a full day. Suggestions were made on the need to address all outstanding issues one by one. This would be the beginning of an elaborative process which could then be integrated into a larger set of recommendations.

All delegations were encouraged to follow up their suggestions by submitting food-for-thought papers for discussion in the AIAM and FSC Working Groups.

REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS

WORKING SESSION 1

Tuesday, 4 March 2008

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

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

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

The co-ordinator opened the session, introducing his food-for-thought paper (distributed in advance under reference No. FSC.AIAM/3/08) designed to facilitate discussion on implementation of Chapters I–VIII of the Vienna Document 1999. The paper suggested a number of possible issues for discussion and encouraged delegations to raise ideas regarding possible ways of improving the implementation of the relevant provisions.

1. Annual exchange of military information

The co-ordinator reminded delegations that 53 participating States had provided their returns in 2007 relating to the Annual Exchange of Military Information (AEMI), which could be looked upon as a positive indication of the way the process was working.

Two questions were posed:

- Would presentations by participating States to the FSC at the Security Dialogue, on the subject of their exchange of information, support participating States and enhance transparency?
- Does the present form and content of the annual exchange of information meet the security concerns of participating States?

Some delegations valued the AEMI as a very important instrument for increasing transparency between the OSCE participating States. At the same time, it was mentioned that there was still room for discussion on how to assist some participating States to improve the

quality of their returns. It was also recalled that the recent FSC decision on improving the availability of FSC-related information was one way to increase the quality of the AEMI.

Another delegation, referring to the Summary Report on Recent Trends in the Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and Other Measures Addressed During the AIAM, issued by the CPC (FSC.GAL/24/07/Corr.1), stated that only a few participating States had provided information regarding paragraph 10.3. The question was why that was the case.

One delegation noted that about 16 per cent of participating States had not provided the photo documentation included in the AEMI. That delegation also mentioned the value of the workshop on implementation of the VD-99 held in Kyrgyzstan in 2007, which had been a very practical event, and suggested that assistance should continue to be provided to participating States in that form.

2. Defence planning

The co-ordinator noted that 44 participating States had provided their returns in 2007, including five nil reports.

Three questions were suggested for discussion:

- Why had certain participating States not provided returns, and how could the FSC help them to do so, by offering assistance or guidance in that regard?
- Could participating States improve this CSBM, and if so, how?
- Should a workshop be held on defence planning? If so, what should its focus be?

One delegation recalled the food-for-thought paper presented in 2007 that had been intended to establish a definite date for submission of defence planning information, and expressed the hope that specific discussions on that issue would be continued in 2008.

Two delegations stated that they had no objection in principle to the holding of a workshop on defence planning to facilitate the appropriate information exchange.

Another delegation pointed out that defence planning information consisted of information on defence expenditures and military doctrines and suggested that defence planning information should be broken down into those two components. That delegation in principle also supported the proposal to establish a definite date for submission of defence planning information. It was also assumed that only the lack of political will prevented participating States from providing proper returns.

Two delegations pointed out that it was more important to encourage participating States to provide accurate information than to meet any artificial deadline. That point was supported in particular by another delegation, which noted that accurate budgetary information could be made available only upon approval of national budgets.

Another delegation stated that it would support in principle any proposal that would increase the number of returns. In that regard, the division of defence planning information into two components and the establishment of a definite date for submission could be supported. That position attracted some support from other delegations.

3. Risk reduction

The co-ordinator encouraged delegations to discuss the following questions:

- Do the terms offer effective response mechanisms that meet the concerns of participating States?
- Should the FSC discuss the matter in detail?
- Are there lessons to be learned from the experiences of participating States in 2007?

In that respect, the co-ordinator referred to the CPC document presented at the joint FSC-PC meeting on 14 November 2007 (SEC.GAL/217/07), which enumerated the OSCE risk reduction instruments.

One delegation noted that many of the existing OSCE mechanisms were too complicated and sometimes confusing. Thus, there was room for improvement, streamlining and updating of such mechanisms. In that regard, the FSC was considered to be an appropriate forum for discussion.

Consequently, another delegation mentioned the concept paper for preparation of the 2008 Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC) (CIO.GAL/36/08), which would address the above-mentioned concerns.

One delegation recalled two food-for-thought papers tabled in 2007 concerning prior notification on major military activities and prior notification of a large-scale military transit in the zone of application of CSBMs. The hope was expressed that those topics would be discussed at FSC meetings in 2008. Another delegation also emphasized the need to discuss the possibility of establishing the information exchange on multinational rapid reaction forces, as well as of holding a special workshop on the subject.

4. Military activities

- (i) Prior notification of certain military activities**
- (ii) Annual calendars**
- (iii) Constraining provisions**
- (iv) Observation of certain military activities**

The co-ordinator briefly updated delegations on the current status of implementation of the provisions of the Vienna Document 1999, referring to the Summary Report on Recent Trends in the Implementation of the VD-99 and Other Measures Addressed During the AIAM issued by the CPC.

The following questions for discussion were proposed:

- Were the existing threshold provisions relevant to 2008? Should others be specified?

- Was the voluntary notification process satisfactory? Should the conducting State invite observers to such military activities?

One delegation noted that practically all military activities held in the zone of application of CSBMs were below the VD-99 thresholds. At the same time, the existing mechanism for voluntary notifications of such activities did not operate effectively. The need to make that measure politically binding was reiterated. The same delegation noted that usually such military activities involved not only army components, but also air force and naval units. It was suggested that the proper information also be included in the above-mentioned notifications.

Two other delegations expressed their satisfaction with the existing system of voluntary notifications, noting the lack of consensus on making them politically binding.

5. Conclusions

During the working session, delegations had the opportunity to highlight their views. A number of ideas and suggestions were put forward by participating States. Many of them can be the subject of further discussion at FSC meetings. Some of the recommendations had already received indications of support.

WORKING SESSION 1 (continued)

Tuesday, 4 March 2008

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

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

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

Working session 1, part B, was co-ordinated by Ms. Berenice Gare, First Secretary at the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the OSCE; the Rapporteur was Ms. Esmira Jafarova, Second Secretary at the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the OSCE. The co-ordinator had distributed in advance her food-for-thought paper (FSC.AIAM /2/08), reflecting questions that might be discussed at the session. Her introductory remarks were made along the lines of the paper, and provided a good basis for further discussions.

1. Contacts

The co-ordinator initiated the discussion with some words about the obligation of the participating States to arrange a visit to military facilities once every five years, in accordance with the provisions of VD-99. It was noted that a number of participating States had not been able to organize visits to military facilities in accordance with VD-99, and the view was expressed that some ways might be sought to improve the situation.

One delegation expressed support for the idea of preparing a compilation of best practice guides on visits to military facilities and combat airbases. The same delegation noted that its Government would host a visit from 12 to 16 May 2008 under the provisions of VD-99 to a combat airbase and military facility, which would also include a cultural programme. Based on the experience gained from that visit in May, it might be possible to draft a generic planning guide that could be tabled for further discussion.

Another delegation also expressed support for the idea of best practice guides and the preparation of a generic planning guide, which could be finalized by the end of 2009. Also some States that had not arranged visits to military facilities and air bases could be invited

before and after the organization of such visits by competent participating States in order to give them an opportunity to get acquainted with the process of planning such visits. Workshops and training events could also be an option for making it possible to discuss the prerequisites for planning of such visits.

One delegation stressed that the drafting of best practice guides should not be used as an excuse for those States that had not so far organized visits to military facilities to further delay doing so.

2. Inspection and evaluation

The co-ordinator opened the topic with a short overview and set out the questions for further discussion. It was noted that, in accordance with the provisions of VD-99, each participating State had the right to conduct inspections on the territory of another participating State within the zone of application of CSBMs. In 2007, 88 inspections had been requested and 84 had been conducted. Four inspections had been refused. One participating State had cited *force majeure* as its reason for refusal. The reasons for the refusal of the other three requests had not been given.

One delegation raised a question about the possible implications of EU membership for inspections and evaluations. Since the 27 members of the EU already had contacts, connections and information exchanges in other formats, that might reduce the need for inspections and evaluations.

Another delegation stated that inspections conducted in accordance with VD-99, Chapter IX, were one of the tools for the implementation of the agreed CSBMs. In 2007, that delegation's Government had received three designated area inspections and one evaluation visit. In 2008, two more inspections had been carried out in that State. It was also noted that, in February 2007, the second airbase visit had been organized by the Government concerned, which had been the only one among its neighbours in the region to do so. The same delegation also expressed its support for the balanced distribution of inspection quotas throughout the year. While reiterating its commitment to the full implementation of VD-99, the same delegation also expressed regret over the fact that some participating States refused to receive inspections without giving proper reasons.

The timeline for submission of inspection requests, responses to requests, inspection reports, inspection and evaluation quotas and the inclusion of guest inspectors in inspection teams was also touched upon. One delegation spoke about the problem of exhaustion of the inspection quota at the beginning of the year, which had become a perennial issue. However, the year 2008 was expected to be the worst one yet in that respect. The same delegation referred to the food-for-thought paper that it had submitted (FSC.DEL/51/08), which proposed a new approach to the distribution of inspection/evaluation quotas over the calendar year. It was also stressed that the first two months of the year were not the most active period in terms of military activities, and therefore, the inspections conducted during that period were unable to assess whether major activities were going on in the designated area. Usually, at other times of the year, when most activities were going on, inspection quotas were exhausted. Therefore, it would be a good idea to split the inspection year into several segments with a certain quota of inspections given in each segment.

Several delegations also expressed their support for the idea of an even distribution of inspection quotas over the year and once again called upon all the participating States not to refuse to receive inspections. One delegation proposed two ways of solving the problem of inspection quotas. One of them would be through bilateral agreements between the OSCE States, which could create extra quotas and end unnecessary quota races. Inviting guest inspectors could be another possibility in that regard. The same delegation also noted that spreading the inspection quotas over the year and dividing the year into segments would involve a danger of spreading the competition over the existing quotas throughout the year.

Another delegation stated that, over the first two months of 2007, the quota race had applied to only a small group of States, while all the other States had still been able to use their quotas throughout the year. Such situations reflected the reality not only of existing military-bloc approaches to verification activities in the OSCE area, but also of their strengthening. It would be desirable to devise a rational solution in terms of modernizing inspection activities. The same delegation agreed that EU and NATO membership also made the inspections of each other by the members of those organizations unnecessary.

One delegation said that its Government usually had some military activities going on in the first two months of the year as well as at other times of year. Although it could be a good idea to divide inspection quotas into quarters, the inspection race would not stop, but would take place during the first week of each quarter. The same delegation also noted that conducting inspections without major military activities was not in the spirit of VD-99.

Another delegation noted that spreading inspection quotas was an option to be studied and compared with all possible solutions (for a further discussion/adoption within the FSC). It would also be an option to consider interpreters as being associated with the auxiliary personnel, which would free up an extra slot for a multinational composition of the inspection team.

One delegation stated that spreading inspection quotas over the year might be a good solution, but not the only one. Inviting guest inspectors to join inspection teams, and also notifying military activities on a voluntary basis and announcing such activities at different times of year could be another approach to solving the problem of inspection quotas.

3. Regional measures

The co-ordinator noted that Chapter X of VD-99 addressed regional measures and encouraged participating States to enter into separate agreements bilaterally, multilaterally or regionally to increase transparency and confidence. In 2007, participating States had requested 12 inspection visits under regional/bilateral agreements. There had been a 100-per-cent success rate.

One delegation spoke about the importance of bilateral regional measures, but also noted that such regional measures between participating States were agreed in addition to those provided for in VD-99. Implementation of regional measures was often in the legitimate interest of all the participating States. Regional measures were valuable additions to the obligations binding on all the participating States subscribing to VD-99. They comprised a tailored response to particular needs relating to regional situations, and contributed to the implementation of the principle of indivisibility of security. Furthermore, the same delegation described the additional CSBMs that its Government had entered into

with other VD-99 participating States. The same delegation proposed that regional measures should continue being discussed at forthcoming AIAM meetings.

Another delegation stressed that its Government attached great importance to the implementation of the regional CSBMs, which were unique tools for enhancing regional security. The same delegation noted that its Government currently had two agreements on CSBMs with its neighbours, which were being implemented in a satisfactory way. As a result of the existence of those CSBMs, the levels for additional notifications and additional inspections and evaluations had been decreased. The same delegation further described in detail the benefits of bilateral CSBMs in terms of verification possibilities.

One delegation said that, although its Government did not have any bilateral agreements, there were agreements with four participating States on conducting VD-99 measures together, as well as other agreements on training. It was noted that, with regional CSBMs, even troops that were not covered by VD-99 could be verified, if that was desired by the parties to the agreement. Through regional CSBMs, the whole VD-99 framework could be expanded.

Another delegation gave the percentages with regard to regional measures in 2007. In 2007, there had been 12 regional and bilateral inspections. There had been 40 evaluations, with an additional 24 regional bilateral evaluations. The same delegation urged the further use of regional measures to complement VD-99.

One delegation stressed that one of the important elements of the regional measures lay in the value they contributed by facilitating contacts and establishing a good network of experts, which provided an effective solution in terms of overcoming administrative hindrances. Another delegation voiced its support for the idea of regional CSBMs as a valuable instrument in facilitating contacts between the experts of the parties concerned.

4. Communication Network

The co-ordinator introduced the subject by stating that the OSCE Communications Network had been described as one of the best functioning, but least known, features of the Organization. In 2007, 50 participating States (one more than in 2006) had been connected. Out of 50 participating States, 47 were connected more than 95 per cent of the time. But one participating State had not connected, despite having the technical capacity to do so.

One delegation spoke about the problem with the new version 2.2 of the integrated notification application (INA), which was the only official version of the Network. The delegation said that one State had altered the official template and inserted into the system a different one that changed the name of that State. It was noted that that fact should be of serious concern to all the States, since it meant that there were serious defects in the system. The same delegation pointed out that, in line with the decision of the Communication Group (FSC.GAL/97/07), the new version 2.2. was the only official INA for use in the Network, and installation of that application was mandatory for all; “partial application” could not be condoned.

Another delegation proposed considering the possibility of connecting the delegations in Vienna to the Communication Network, so that they also would have access to the important data on the Network.

5. Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI)

The co-ordinator gave some statistics initially. In 2007, 52 participating States had participated in the GEMI, which had taken place in Vienna on 30 April 2007 and had ranked highest ever in terms of compliance with the deadline. Forty-five participating States had also participated in the automated data exchange, compared with 40 in 2006 and 44 in 2005. Questions such as the advantages and disadvantages of combining the dates for submission of data for the GEMI and AEMI, as well as hard copy versus soft copy exchanges were raised for discussion. Several delegations expressed their support for the idea of a single deadline for AEMI and GEMI and noted that, for practical reasons, that could be more time- and cost-effective. However, several other delegations expressed their concern regarding the idea and stressed their preference for keeping the AEMI and GEMI deadlines separate, in order to be able to deliver information of a higher calibre.

6. Conclusion

The discussion was lively and constructive, and provided an opportunity for effective exchanges of opinions on a number of important issues.

WORKING SESSION 2

Wednesday, 5 March 2008

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

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

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

Working session 2 was co-ordinated by Mr. Vasily Pavlov, First Secretary in the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Belarus to the OSCE, JCG and OSCE; the rapporteur was Mr. Dan Sebastian Neculaescu, Second Secretary in the Permanent Mission of Romania to the International Organizations in Vienna. The co-ordinator had distributed in advance his food-for-thought paper (FSC.AIAM/6/08) aimed at promoting free discussions and identifying possible shortcomings in the CSBM implementation process.

1. Principles governing conventional arms transfers

The co-ordinator introduced the topic by raising a number of issues with regard to the implementation of the current regulations governing conventional arms transfers. He referred to conventional arms transfers as a valuable tool for preventing illicit trafficking and combating terrorism. He also reminded the participants about the proposal discussed in the FSC for bringing categories of weapons and equipment systems subject to information exchange into compliance with the new provisions set out in the UN Register of Conventional Arms.

No delegation wished to take the floor on the subject.

2. Principles governing non-proliferation

One delegation commended the work that had thus far been done by the FSC on the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, and encouraged the participating States to continue to work on the best practices guide on UN Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) in order to achieve some tangible results before the summer recess.

3. Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations

Some delegations highlighted the continuing importance of the document adopted in 1993 and proposed a revision or an update of the mechanism embodied in it. That proposal could be further considered under the FSC's auspices. Furthermore, it was suggested that the document should be used in the co-operation process with OSCE partners.

4. Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines

Two delegations drew the attention of the participating States to the special meeting of FSC Working Group A on anti-personnel landmines (APL) held in January 2008, stressing the need for further concrete follow-up work on the subject by the FSC, especially bearing in mind its importance for the OSCE.

Support was expressed for this approach, and the importance of co-ordination of efforts with other international organizations in order to avoid duplication was stressed. One delegation described its activities in the field of APL and another presented a concrete suggestion regarding the reformulation of a question in the Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines.

The possibility was mentioned of inviting other relevant representatives from international organizations to participate in FSC meetings in order to further contribute towards identifying the OSCE's niches in the area.

5. Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security

The FSC Co-ordinator on the Code of Conduct presented a comprehensive update on the ongoing efforts to promote the Code, including the FSC decision on raising awareness, as well as the proposal for an updated questionnaire which would incorporate all the contributions made during the special meetings of the FSC in 2006 and 2007. He also stressed the continuing importance of the Code of Conduct and the overarching aim of improving its implementation. An appeal was made to all the participating States to become actively involved in the issue by promoting new ideas and possible initiatives designed to improve the implementation of the Code of Conduct.

Numerous delegations supported the work done by the FSC thus far on the Code of Conduct and some welcomed the initiative to further improve the Questionnaire. It was also stated that an evaluation of the current draft proposal on updating the Questionnaire was needed, bearing in mind the importance of avoiding questions that would entail duplications.

Also, one delegation pointed out that work on the Code of Conduct should not be aimed at reviewing its provisions.

One delegation expressed the hope that, after the adoption of the current draft proposal on updating the Questionnaire before the end of the year, participating States would find the new Questionnaire easier to reply to. Two other delegations described their national efforts in regard to promoting the Code of Conduct.

6. OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW)

The co-ordinator opened the discussion by recalling that, during 2001–2006, the participating States had destroyed more than 6.4 million items of SALW (more than 1.1 million in 2006). He pointed out that 43 participating States had provided information regarding the quantity of SALW identified as surplus or seized and destroyed and that a total of 47 States had provided annual information on their exports and imports of SALW. He also referred to the importance of increasing the OSCE's visibility in efforts related to SALW.

The FSC Co-ordinator on SALW projects gave a detailed review of the projects on destruction of SALW, calling attention to the activities planned in the near future as well as the success thus far achieved in implementing them. He noted that better communication with other relevant international organizations in that respect was required. Acknowledging the existence of some room for improvement, he spoke of the experience gained by the OSCE in the destruction of SALW since receiving the first request for assistance in 2003. Also, he encouraged participating States to involve themselves more actively as donors in such projects.

One delegation supported the work done by the OSCE in connection with small arms and light weapons and stated that the Organization found itself at the forefront of international efforts. However, its visibility remained low in comparison with other actors. Therefore, it proposed that communication be improved with international organizations, and especially the United Nations.

Another delegation highlighted the importance of more visibility for the OSCE in the area of SALW and proposed that a special meeting of the FSC should be organized as early as possible (it was suggested May), before the Third Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW. The outcome of such discussions could enhance the OSCE's work under UN auspices. Other participating States supported that proposal.

A delegation expressed gratitude for the assistance provided in implementing one of the SALW projects and informed the participants concerning the latest developments. It also expressed support for a special meeting of the FSC on SALW, which could contribute to the work of the UN Programme of Action.

One delegation drew attention to the importance of maintaining coherence in reporting the exports and imports of SALW, stating that more attention should be devoted to the content of the returns. It was pointed out that the problem of some apparent errors in the returns could be explained by the different national provisions regarding the registering of exports and imports.

7. OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (SCA)

The co-ordinator introduced the topic, pointing out that 21 requests for assistance on stockpiles of conventional ammunition from OSCE participating States had resulted in 12 projects to be implemented, and referring to the detailed discussions that had taken place at the FSC Workshop devoted to SALW and SCA held in February 2008.

One delegation suggested that an exchange of information on ammunition should be subject to further evaluation in the FSC. It also suggested that the participating States could bring together their experts in the field in order to discuss a possible solution. Another delegation supported that proposal.

One delegation took the opportunity to describe the ongoing efforts to implement another SALW project on its territory.

At the end of the session, the importance of finalizing the work on the best practices guide on stockpiles of conventional ammunition in 2008 was stressed.

8. Principles for export controls of MANPADS

One delegation presented the initiative it had brought in the FSC on principles for export controls of MANPADS, pointing out that a revision in 2007 by the Wassenaar Arrangement of its previous decision on the subject called for certain modifications of FSC decision No.3/04 on MANPADS adopted in 2004.

Another delegation stressed the importance of efficient national provisions designed to reduce the risk of proliferation of conventional weapons, especially to non-State actors.

9. Principles on the control of brokering in SALW

In the light of the FSC decision on exchange of information with regard to the OSCE principles on the control of brokering in SALW, the CPC representative provided the participating States with information on the returns of the one-off information exchange that had taken place in January 2008 and the report on the matter circulated under reference FSC.GAL/25/08. She noted that 39 returns had been transmitted in time and another four replies had been received after the report had been issued. She also noted that, in the absence of a generally accepted definition of brokering in national legislations, it was difficult to determine the applicability of such legislation specifically to brokering activities, which were different from export and import operations.

One delegation envisaged the possibility of a follow-up to the FSC decision, suggesting that a further discussion could take place in the working groups. It also referred to the importance of mutual assistance among participating States on the matter. The same delegation proposed that the CPC report should be reviewed in order to include the delayed submissions, thus providing a full picture of the implementation situation concerning the control of brokering in SALW. It suggested that the CPC report should be made public.

10. Standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports

Following the pattern created by the FSC decision on the one-off exchange of information with regard to the OSCE principles on the control of brokering in SALW, one delegation suggested that a similar exchange of information on end-user certificates could take place in 2009.

11. Conclusions

The discussion was open and lively and showed that the issue of operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures and documents continues to be a significant element in the AIAM agenda.

WORKING SESSION 3

Wednesday, 5 March 2008

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

Suggestions aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs

1. Introduction

Working session 3 was co-ordinated by Mr. Lucien Kleinjan from the delegation of the Netherlands. The Chairperson was Mr. Arnout Pauwels from the Belgian delegation. The rapporteur was Mr. Valerio Negro from the Italian delegation.

The co-ordinator opened the session by noting that the issue of the improvement of the implementation of existing CSBMs had been raised on numerous occasions in the past, both in and outside the AIAM, most recently on 24 October 2007 during the Special FSC Meeting on Existing and Future Arms Control and Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in the OSCE Area; that such a session had been included in the AIAM's agenda for the first time in 2007; and that some delegations had put forward specific proposals on improvement of the implementation of CSBMs in the FSC.

2. Conduct of the session

The co-ordinator raised some issues on which delegations might want to open a debate, e.g.: What shortcomings were being encountered in implementation of the CSBMs? If any, what might be the remedies and how much scope was there for improvement? Was there any room for new CSBMs to respond to new challenges regarding the security of the OSCE area? Should the participating States debate any new CSBM within the confines of the Vienna Document 1999 (hereinafter, VD-99), or should they look for new measures, complementary or supplementary to those in the VD-99?

The following elements emerged from the session:

- One delegation remarked that the VD-99 left a lot of leeway for participating States to shape new CSBMs on a voluntary basis, and that the limits set by the VD-99 itself were already being exceeded by some delegations as an encouragement to other delegations to join them or to come up with original solutions and proposals for new CSBMs. The same delegation pointed out that, with a positive enough approach, gaps in the VD-99 could be voluntarily filled, thus improving the implementation of CSBMs;
- One delegation argued that, in order for that approach to be really effective, measures aimed at a better implementation of CSBMs must be backed up by, and possibly be approved as, formal FSC decisions. Any step-by-step approach, even affecting only small aspects of improvement of the implementation of CSBMs, must take place in a formal setting and through binding instruments such as FSC decisions;

- Another delegation urged participants to consider that no discussion took place in a political vacuum, and that no debate on the improvement of implementation of CSBMs could take place without an acknowledgement of the suspension of the implementation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe by one participating State. That delegation urged that that situation should not be allowed to taint the work that was being done in the FSC and committed itself to continued engagement in respect of all elements of the VD-99, including improvement of the implementation of CSBMs;
- One delegation agreed that the participating States should take the VD-99 as a basis for any national CSBM, and that the level of confidence-building was laid down by the VD-99 and then supplemented by FSC decisions. Voluntary supplementary CSBMs should be welcome — as long as they encouraged other participating States to follow suit — and the prospect of entirely new CSBMs should not be ruled out in principle.

3. Conclusions

The Chairperson wrapped up the session by noting that the almost complete lack of discussion was a surprise — considering the interest raised by the session on the same subject in 2007 — and at the same time not a surprise, since the issue was being tackled frequently in the FSC. The Chairperson invited the delegations to consider whether a similar session should still take place at the AIAM in 2009.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

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

Vienna, 4 and 5 March 2008

Mr. Chairperson,

As chairperson of the closing session of the Eighteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM), held in Vienna on 4 and 5 March 2008, Bosnia and Herzegovina has the honour of reporting to the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) on the proceedings, discussions and results of this Meeting.

The aim of the Meeting was to discuss the present and future implementation of agreed confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs), as established in Chapter XI of the Vienna Document 1999 (VD-99). In open and constructive discussions, the experts exchanged experiences, made suggestions, and gave their assessments of the implementation of the OSCE commitments in the field of CSBMs.

The agenda and modalities of the Eighteenth AIAM had been agreed upon in FSC Decision No. 7/07. The Meeting consisted of three working sessions. The opening session was chaired by Belgium, while Bosnia and Herzegovina chaired the closing session. The discussions in each working session were moderated by a co-ordinator and summarized by a rapporteur.

1. Opening session

The chairperson of the opening session and working sessions stressed the importance of the AIAM as an opportunity for the participating States to reflect on the implementation of agreed CSBMs, and on the relevance and validity of the commitments embodied in the VD-99 and other FSC agreements and decisions; it furthermore prepared fertile ground for continuing work in the FSC. The Chairperson made a brief introduction to his perspective on the event. He encouraged delegations to address items and tools which were working and to also examine and look for obstacles.

The current Chairmanship of the Forum for Security Co-operation, Spain, provided brief information in its report (FSC.AIAM/4/08) about the activities of the FSC and the implementation of CSBMs since the last Meeting in March 2007. In his report the representative of the FSC Chairmanship reminded all delegations of the Ministerial Council requests to the Forum for Security Co-operation to submit progress reports to the Sixteenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council in 2008 on the following matters, through its Chairperson:

- The continuing implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons and the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition;
- Efforts to further improve the implementation of the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security;
- Efforts in the field of arms control agreements and confidence- and security-building measures in accordance with its mandate.

The Spanish delegation reiterated its conviction that the Vienna Document 1999 has to be fully respected and implemented by all the participating States.

The Director of the CPC reported on the main activities of the CPC in support of the FSC during 2007 (FSC.AIAM/16/08). The Director mentioned that by looking through the summary report distributed as FSC.GAL/18/08 on 11 February 2008, one can easily notice that the main implementation trends outlined in the first CPC summary report to the AIAM in 2007 have generally continued. Individual assistance to participating States in the implementation of their politico-military commitments remained a priority and a daily task. The next major focus of the CPC agenda was small arms light weapons (SALW) and stockpiles of conventional ammunition (SCA). In addition, he referred to the completion of the modernization and upgrading of the OSCE Communications Network and noted that the FSC Section continued to operate and maintain the OSCE Communications Network to facilitate the implementation of numerous politico-military commitments, the Treaty on Open Skies, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty) and, new in 2007, the Dayton Peace Agreement. The CPC will continue, in accordance with its mandate, to provide required support for the FSC and its Chairmanship in their efforts to further assist participating States.

The delegation of Finland, as Chairmanship of the OSCE, delivered its statement during the opening session. Finland welcomed the meeting of the heads of verification centres, which was held for the second consecutive time on the day prior to the AIAM as having added important elements to our discussions for the AIAM at the technical level.

Some documents, such as the Code of Conduct (CoC) on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, have activated a record number of submissions last year. Finland welcomed the seminars and workshops on the implementation of the CoC in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Montenegro, which were held in 2007. The recent decision adopted by the FSC on awareness raising and outreach of the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security are of great value.

As Chairmanship, Finland called upon all participating States to intensify the implementation of already existing politico-military commitments and stood ready to consider possible new proposals. It is that the OSCE should strive for more transparency and effectiveness in fulfilling our obligations, and assist — through the work of the field operations and various projects — other participating States in building their capacity.

Several delegations distributed their statements during the opening session or announced that their statements will be distributed.

2. Working sessions

Working session 1 was co-ordinated by Colonel Bernard Donagh, Military Adviser in the Permanent Mission of Ireland to the OSCE. The rapporteur was Colonel Alexander Taran, Military Adviser in the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the OSCE. Working session 1 (continued) was co-ordinated by Dr. Bernice Gare, First Secretary in the United Kingdom Delegation to the OSCE. The rapporteur was Ms. Esmira Jafarova, Second Secretary in the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan. Working session 2 was co-ordinated by Mr. Vasily Pavlov, First Secretary of the Permanent Delegation of Belarus.

The rapporteur was Mr. Sebastian Danut Neculaescu, Second Secretary of the Permanent Mission of Romania. Working session 3, was co-ordinated by Mr. Lucien Kleinjan, Counsellor of the Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the OSCE. The rapporteur was Mr. Valerio Negro, First Secretary of the Permanent Mission of Italy. The co-ordinators had circulated introductory papers, and those food-for-thought papers, in general, were designed to stimulate and encourage discussion about the topics covered in the sessions.

Detailed and comprehensive information about the debates in each session can be found in the reports of the respective working session rapporteurs (FSC.AIAM/17/08; FSC.AIAM/20/08; FSC.AIAM/21/08 and FSC.AIAM/18/08).

3. Closing session

At the closing session, the four rapporteurs delivered their reports on the proceedings and the results of the working sessions (FSC.AIAM/17/08; FSC.AIAM/20/08; FSC.AIAM/21/08 and FSC.AIAM/18/08). There was no expressed disagreement with the reports presented.

Under the item “general discussion”, several delegations took the floor and commented on the Eighteenth AIAM.

Some delegations referred to the need for more open discussion in the future and expressed their disappointment with the lack of such open and focused discussions during the Eighteenth AIAM.

Two delegations delivered their statements on Gibraltar in the framework of the Vienna Document 1999. Both statements were attached to the journal of the AIAM as requested.

The agenda and dates for the 2009 AIAM will be decided by the Forum for Security Co-operation in the near future.

The Chairperson of the closing session noted that the review of implementation of confidence- and security-building measures was an important annual event. In his view, the implementation of those measures remained the main priority for the FSC.

In closing, the Chairperson expressed his appreciation to all OSCE delegations and the Partners for Co-operation for participating in the whole Meeting. He also thanked the current FSC Chairmanship, Spain, and Belgium as the Chair of the opening session and to the co-ordinators and rapporteurs of the working sessions, the experts from capitals and the CPC, as well as the interpreters and Conference Services for their invaluable support during the Eighteenth AIAM.

Mr. Chairperson, this is a brief abstract of the Eighteenth AIAM. More detailed information can be found in the documents referred to in this report.