



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

The Secretariat

Conflict Prevention Centre

Vienna, 4 March 2003

Director's Situation Report on CPC Work In Support the FSC Activity

Mr. Chairman,

Thank you for the opportunity to give a brief overview of the work done by the CPC in support of the FSC activity during the last year.

In accordance with Chapter XI of the Vienna Document 1999, after the AIAM 2002 the CPC compiled and circulated a survey of suggestions made by Delegations during that Meeting. This document constituted a basis for the follow-up discussion in the FSC on the implementation issues suggested by Delegations, which resulted in the adoption of Decision 10/02 on the Revised Announcing and Reminding Mechanism, and the Chairperson's Perception on the Implementation of Certain Provisions of the VD-99.

As far as the FSC attention was to a significant degree devoted to implementing tasks stemming from the Bucharest Plan of Action for Combating Terrorism, the FSC Support Unit also focused its activity on providing an appropriate support to Delegations. Many of the FSC tasks were identified in the Road Map for the implementation of the Bucharest Plan, which singled out the Document on SALW and the Code of Conduct as central to the OSCE's fight against terrorism. At the same time, the Road Map stipulated the examination of the FSC documents relevance to combating terrorism. In order to facilitate this discussion, at the request of the FSC Chair, the CPC prepared a "Background paper" that included a brief synopsis of each document to be examined.

As regards the OSCE Document on SALW, the FSC explored ways to increase the efficiency of information exchange, including making available for participating States additional practical tools such as "model answers", "templates" and "best practice guides". With the purpose to support this FSC endeavour, the CPC prepared the Model Answers for the 2001

OSCE information exchange, and Templates for the 2002 and following annual exchanges. We are pleased to note that a number of participating States provided on a voluntary basis updates of their 2001 information by use of the above-mentioned Model Answers.

With regard to the Best Practice Guides, the FSC adopted a Decision which envisages the development of guidance on eight different areas related to the control of SALW by encouraging interested participating States to undertake the preparation of this document with the technical assistance and under the overall coordination of the CPC. The preparatory work has been going on in a satisfactory manner and all parts of the document have already been submitted by their authors for further consideration in the Editorial Board especially established for this purpose.

The CPC also provided its support to the FSC in the course of joint PC- FSC deliberations aimed at the implementation of the Section V of the Document on SALW, which concerns measures tailored for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. These resulted in the FSC expert advice on this issue, which is subject of the PC final decision.

The facilitation of information exchanges, particularly the Annual and Global Exchanges of Military Information, was another core task for the CPC in 2002. Furthermore, the CPC hosted the Annual Exchange of Information Automated Data Workshop in April and December 2002, in which 43 participating States exchanged electronic submissions, an increase over the previous year. The FSC Support Unit continued to support and foster the implementation of the CSBM regime through its practice of providing to the FSC and its working groups regular monthly and quarterly surveys, as well as compilations and background papers.

Regarding the OSCE Communications Network, the OSCE Communications Group met in February, May, September, and December 2002. Procedures for its sub-working groups, the Configuration Control Board and Project Management Team, were also reorganized and streamlined for more effectiveness. The Forum was very active in taking four decisions approving continued network operations and, more importantly, calling for the network's technological modernization.

This modernization project made significant progress. However, its timely completion will depend upon cooperation from capitals in following the prescribed procedures and making the necessary technical preparations. If, for any reason, not all networked States have made the transition to the modernized network by June 2003, the Forum will have to decide on extending the transition period for those capitals. On the other hand, if participating States actively cooperate, the project should be completed on time: I would therefore urge all of you to make every possible effort to meet the June deadline.

The CPC continued to work with capitals to expand network connectivity to all participating States, thereby enhancing future CSBM implementation. Information was provided in conjunction with seminars held in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Kyrgyzstan. As additional support to delegations, the CPC continued to distribute all CSBM, CFE, and OS Treaty notifications to non-networked signatory States.

The reported period of time was marked by two important events organised and conducted within the Forum, namely: the Expert Meeting on Combating Terrorism within the Politico-Military Dimension of the OSCE held on 14 – 15 May 2002 and the Third Follow-up Conference on the Code of Conduct held on 23 – 24 September 2002. The CPC played an active role in organising and conducting these events, especially the Follow-up Conference.

Upon request of the FSC, the FSC Support Unit has prepared an overview of the information exchanged by the participating States in response to the Code of Conduct Questionnaire, which, reinforced by seconded experts from Finland and Germany, provided a useful basis for discussion during the Conference.

Responding to calls made during the Conference for increased awareness of the Code, the CPC organized on 4-5 November 2002 a regional seminar on the democratic control of armed forces and the Code of Conduct in Belgrade. The event was held in co-operation with the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. Parliamentarians and military personnel from eight countries attended, shared their experiences, and agreed on a number of recommendations with regard to implementing parliamentary oversight of the decision making process in defence sphere. We plan to make the practice of organising joint meetings for representatives of executive and legislative a regular one.

More generally, the FSC SU paid a special attention to providing its assistance to participating States in the practical implementation their commitments in the sphere of politico-military security. During the reported period the CPC organized a number of seminars and roundtables for parliamentarians, military personnel and government officials. National workshops on the implementation of the Code and the CSBM regime, sponsored by Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom, were organized in all Caucasus participating States in June, and in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in November. Notably, the support provided by the OSCE field missions and operations while preparing to the above-mentioned events was extremely useful.

These focused largely on those provisions of the Code which deal with democratic control of the armed forces and respect for international humanitarian law. The importance of timely exchange of information prescribed in the VD-99 and other FSC documents was another issue addressed to in the course of the seminars. The participants considered these events very useful and it was agreed that the CPC should continue this kind of support activity. In this regard, the CPC, in co-operation with the respective governments, intends to hold in May national seminars in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, as well as in Turkmenistan on a later stage.

In fact, the increasing role of the FSU as a focal point for the development of more coherent strategies, also at a regional level, in the politico-military dimension of security, including the organization of seminars, focussed coordination meetings with our field missions and the development of specific projects, such as in Termez-Hayraton, points to the need to reconfigure this unit as a “Cooperative Security Section” within the CPC; a slight strengthening of the resources will also be necessary, in my view, to allow the CPC to continue offering its effective support to the FSC while consolidating its role as a focal point on pol.mil and on broader security issues, including in the light of the upcoming Annual Security Review Conference.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my report, I would like to encourage delegations to indicate to us possible areas where CPC could further enhance its support. The CPC staff will follow the discussions during this meeting and render assistance whenever requested. We wish you every success in your work.

Thank you for your attention.