



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

OSLO

1998

Seventh Meeting of the Ministerial Council

2-3 December 1998

Oslo Ministerial Declaration

Statement on Kosovo

Decisions of the Oslo Ministerial Council Meeting

Chairman's Summary

Reports to the Oslo Ministerial Council Meeting

Oslo 1998



Error! Switch argument not specified.

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

OSLO

1998

Seventh Meeting of the Ministerial Council

2-3 December 1998

Oslo Ministerial Declaration

Statement on Kosovo

Decisions of the Oslo Ministerial Council Meeting

Chairman's Summary

Reports to the Oslo Ministerial Council Meeting

Oslo 1998

MC.DOC/1/98
3 December 1998

Original: ENGLISH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Oslo Ministerial Declaration.....	1
II. Statement on Kosovo	7
III. Decisions of the Oslo Ministerial Council Meeting	
Decision on Georgia (MC(7).DEC/1).....	11
Decision on Moldova (MC(7).DEC/2)	13
Decision on a Document-Charter on European Security: The Way Ahead (MC(7).DEC/3)	15
Decision on the further operational strengthening of the OSCE (MC(7).DEC/4).....	16
Decision on enhancement of the OSCE's operational capabilities regarding Roma and Sinti issues (MC(7).DEC/5)	17
Decision on the location of the Office of the High Commissioner on National Minorities (MC(7).DEC/6)	18
Decision on Central Asia (MC(7).DEC/7).....	19
Decision on the Chairmanship in the Year 2000 (MC(7).DEC/8).....	20
IV. Chairman's Summary	23
V. Reports to the Oslo Ministerial Council Meeting	
Chairman-in-Office's Activity Report for 1998	29
Chairman-in-Office's Progress Report on the Work in 1998 on a Document-Charter on European Security	37
Letter from the Chairman of the Forum for Security Co-operation to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Poland, Chairman of the Seventh Ministerial Council of the OSCE	96
Letter from the Chairman of the Joint Consultative Group to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Poland, Chairman of the Seventh Ministerial Council of the OSCE	98
Report by the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on the Implementation of Articles II and IV of Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina	101
Report by the Special Representative of the Chairman-in-Office for Negotiations under Article V of Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina	104

I. OSLO MINISTERIAL DECLARATION

OSLO MINISTERIAL DECLARATION

I.

We have discussed the challenges to security in our region, the OSCE's contribution to meeting them and how this can be developed in future. We stress the need for the international community to develop co-ordinated responses to such challenges. 1998 has been an important year in this regard, including for the OSCE.

The crisis in Kosovo has come to the forefront of the OSCE's concerns and action. We urge the parties to stop all violence and to co-operate in the negotiation of a political settlement.

The Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM) is the largest and most difficult operation ever put into the field by the OSCE. It marks the international community's recognition of the Organization's developing potential and expertise to contribute to security. Success for the KVM requires not only the use of internal mechanisms for transparent consultations, but also effective co-operation with other inter-governmental bodies, as well as with non-governmental organizations; and it requires adequate allocation of resources by participating States.

This year the OSCE successfully supervised the general elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It will continue to further the gradual processes of transferring responsibility for democracy building to the authorities in this country.

The OSCE role in police monitoring in the Danubian region of Croatia marks a new and practical development of the OSCE's operational capabilities.

The OSCE will continue and strengthen its efforts directed at the resolution of conflicts in Georgia and Moldova, as well as the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. It is necessary that the OSCE responds with equal energy and determination to all of its tasks.

We welcome the Memoranda of Understanding signed between the OSCE/Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and the governments of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan aimed at deepening the co-operation in the fields of democracy and human rights. We take note of the proposal of the Chairman-in-Office to open OSCE offices in the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Azerbaijan.

We note with satisfaction the growing involvement of the OSCE in Central Asia and welcome the establishment of the OSCE Centres in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan as a further expression of our commitment to promote stability and co-operation throughout the entire OSCE area. We also welcome the signature by the Chairman-in-Office of Memoranda of Understanding on co-operation between the OSCE/Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and the governments of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.

We recognize that the expansion of OSCE operations requires further strengthening of operational capabilities of the OSCE, including its Secretariat, and appreciate that the Secretary General has taken initial steps towards this goal. We support an early finalization of an OSCE strategy for training, the object of which is to enhance the ability of the Organization to carry out its tasks.

II.

We have taken stock of the progress this year in the work on a Document-Charter on European Security. This has been achieved through focused, target-oriented negotiation. Emphasis has been on the practical development of OSCE instruments for action, including co-operation with other organizations and institutions. At both conceptual and practical level, there has been progress in the development of the OSCE Platform for Co-operative Security as an instrument enhancing European solidarity and partnership and one of the essential elements of a Document-Charter. Developments on the ground have enriched the discussion of the role of the OSCE in conflict settlement.

We urge rapid progress in the development of a Document-Charter.

III.

We conclude once again that the potential of the OSCE to contribute to security stems from its broad membership, its shared values, and its decision making based on transparency and consensus. We underline that respect for OSCE principles and implementation of OSCE commitments remain fundamental to security. Promoting compliance and reinforcing thereby democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including rights of persons belonging to national minorities, the development of free market economies and social progress, and alleviating the plight of refugees and displaced persons, require constant effort. Primary responsibility for achieving these goals lies with individual States, but much depends upon solidarity in the OSCE and a genuine partnership based on sovereign equality.

We stress the importance of sub-regional and bilateral co-operation to complement OSCE-wide activities in the promotion of solidarity and partnership.

This spirit of solidarity and partnership is essential to OSCE's capacity to respond to risks and challenges to security. This extends not only to partnership between States, but to co-operation among the different organizations and institutions to which those States belong. In this pragmatic, flexible and non-hierarchical co-operation the OSCE should continue to develop its own operational activities in areas in which it has proved its strength.

We recognize that the OSCE police operations are now an integral part of the Organization's efforts in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. International police operations can provide an important contribution to building a society based on the rule of law that can consolidate democracy and enhance respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The participating States will enhance the capacity of the OSCE with regard to police operations. To this end, close co-operation with the international organizations having relevant experience in conducting police operations, and in the first instance the United Nations, will be established.

IV.

We reaffirm our commitment to arms control as an important element of our common security.

We reaffirm the importance of the CFE Treaty as a cornerstone of European security. Full implementation of the Treaty and its adaptation to the changing security environment in Europe will be an essential contribution to our common and indivisible security. In this context, we take note of the report by the Chairman of the Joint Consultative Group. We welcome the commitment made by the States Parties to complete the adaptation process by

the time of the OSCE Summit in 1999. This goal will require that outstanding key issues be resolved and drafting begun in the first months of next year. We welcome the mutual commitment by the States Parties to redouble their efforts to achieve this goal.

We take positive note of the report on the activities of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC). We declare the objective to complete the work on the review of the Vienna Document 1994 by the OSCE Summit in 1999. We welcome the increased attention given by the FSC to the regional dimension of security and confidence building measures, in accordance with the decisions of the Lisbon Summit and the Copenhagen Ministerial meeting.

We reaffirm the significance of the Open Skies Treaty and the necessity of its entry into force without delay.

We note with satisfaction that agreement was achieved on the mandate for negotiations on regional stability, as foreseen under Article V of Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

V.

We reaffirm that strengthened security and co-operation in adjacent areas, in particular the Mediterranean, is important for stability in the OSCE region.

We welcome Jordan as a new Mediterranean Partner for Co-operation. We value the long-standing relationship with the Mediterranean Partners and their interest in the work of the OSCE. As mutual dialogue develops, improvements in mechanisms of co-operation to reinforce the principles and values of the OSCE could be considered. We support the work of the Mediterranean Contact Group in Vienna and encourage the Mediterranean Partners to continue to contribute to OSCE activities including through sending visitors to OSCE missions and guest observers to OSCE election monitoring operations.

The OSCE welcomes support for its activities from its Partners for Co-operation. We appreciate the contributions of Japan and the Republic of Korea to OSCE efforts. We thank Japan for its generous financial support for Bosnia and Herzegovina elections and in the context of Kosovo.

II. STATEMENT ON KOSOVO

STATEMENT ON KOSOVO

The plight of so many people in Kosovo caught up in violent confrontation and fleeing their homes in fear has moved us all.

Involvement in Kosovo represents a challenge and an opportunity for the OSCE. It shows that security, democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms are inseparable.

Thanks to the vigorous efforts of the international community, including the OSCE, there is now a ceasefire. It is still fragile, but it marks a great step forward. Displaced persons and refugees are starting to return to their homes. Now further diplomatic efforts are underway to find a political solution. Those efforts have our strong support.

There is still violence in Kosovo, and this is of deep concern to us. We urge all parties involved to stop the violence and to resolve their differences by peaceful means. We urge the FRY authorities, Serbian authorities and all Kosovo Albanians to co-operate in the search for a political settlement, so that substantial political dialogue could start as soon as possible. The international community is determined to help. But only the parties can overcome their differences. The sooner they do so, the sooner the reconstruction and development of Kosovo can make headway.

United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1160 and 1199 set out what is required of the parties to bring the confrontation to an end. Those resolutions have confirmed also the need to respect the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the FRY, while securing a political settlement for Kosovo, involving substantive, broad and meaningful self-administration. The OSCE has taken on the task of verifying that all parties are complying with these Resolutions.

The OSCE is setting up its largest ever operation, the Kosovo Verification Mission. Besides verifying compliance, the KVM will help to implement the political settlement to be reached by the parties by supervising elections, providing support in building up democratic institutions and assisting with police force development in Kosovo. We intend to do this effectively, and in a manner in which the views of governments contributing to KVM are taken fully into account.

The head of the KVM, Ambassador Walker, his team and the OSCE Secretariat have worked very hard in the past few weeks to establish the Mission. Numbers are building up quickly. We encourage all those involved to continue their excellent work. The OSCE will continue to work in close co-ordination with other international organizations and NGOs involved in the international effort in Kosovo.

We urge all parties to the conflict to respect the ceasefire, to comply fully with relevant Security Council Resolutions, and to co-operate closely with the KVM so that it can carry out its duties unimpeded throughout Kosovo. The OSCE, for its part, will respect fully the terms of the agreement on the establishment of the KVM signed by Foreign Minister Geremek as the Chairman-in-Office, and Foreign Minister Jovanovic. We stress that its implementation will be important for any future consideration of FRY participation in the OSCE.

The staff of the KVM must be able to carry out their duties safely. The OSCE verifiers are not a fighting force. Although their true protection is compliance by all parties

with the terms of agreement, security must be in place to protect them. The OSCE welcomes the commitment of other organizations to provide assistance and protect the OSCE and its verifiers in its mission in Kosovo, in case it would be required.

It is our hope and belief that the KVM will make the path to a settlement to the conflict in Kosovo easier. We will continue to give it our full support. But it is for the parties themselves to go down that path and to ensure that Kosovo can look forward to a peaceful future.

III. DECISIONS OF THE
OSLO MINISTERIAL COUNCIL MEETING

DECISION ON GEORGIA
(MC(7).DEC/1)

Ministers appreciate the efficient co-operation between Georgia and the OSCE. They stress that the OSCE should intensify its efforts in the conflict resolution process as well as in monitoring the situation in the sphere of building democratic institutions in Georgia. Ministers emphasize that the lack of progress in the peaceful settlement of conflicts in Georgia requires additional measures to increase the safety of the international personnel and transparency regarding military armaments and equipment in the conflict areas.

Ministers acknowledge certain progress in the process of peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Tskhinvali Region/South Ossetia, Georgia, in particular with regard to the military-security situation and the return of refugees and internally displaced persons. They stress that there is an immediate need to increase efforts on all sides to promote the activities related to political negotiations on the definition of the political status of this region and facilitation of the process of the return of refugees.

Ministers express the hope that meaningful progress will soon be achieved with respect to a peaceful solution of the conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia. They strongly condemn the violent acts in the Gali District of Abkhazia, Georgia, in May and June 1998, resulting in mass destruction and the forcible expulsion of Georgian population. In this respect they recall numerous United Nations documents, the OSCE Budapest Decision and in particular the Lisbon Summit Declaration where utmost support for the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Georgia within its internationally recognized borders was underlined. They also condemn the terrorist activities. They stress the need to refrain from the use of force, the importance of the prompt, immediate, safe and unconditional return of the refugees to the Gali District and the immediate conclusion of bilateral negotiations on this issue as a precondition for a comprehensive settlement of the conflict.

Ministers stress that the Geneva process is a leading framework for the peaceful settlement of conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia, and underline the primary responsibility of the United Nations for advancing this process. They declare the OSCE's readiness to assist the United Nations in their efforts. They appeal to the United Nations and the Group of Friends of the United Nations Secretary-General, as the initiators of the Geneva process, and the Russian Federation, as a facilitator, to activate their efforts with a view to implementing the already adopted decisions and undertakings. They ask the OSCE Chairman-in-Office to stay in close contact with the Friends of the United Nations Secretary-General on all matters concerning Abkhazia, Georgia. They declare the OSCE's readiness to participate in the implementation of a final and comprehensive settlement, including assistance to a local administration of the Gali District, particularly with regard to a joint mechanism of investigation of criminal cases in the zone of conflict and law enforcement body.

Ministers stress that promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, monitoring of the smooth and safe return of refugees, and assisting in the development of legal and democratic institutions and processes, in particular in establishment of a joint local administration in the Gali District with the participation of the returnees, can contribute to a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia. In that respect they ask the OSCE Chairman-in-Office to conduct with the United Nations Secretary-General, and within the OSCE, appropriate consultations exploring the utility of the establishment of an OSCE office in the Gali District. Ministers emphasize that all necessary measures should be taken to ensure the safety of the personnel of this office.

Ministers express their support for the Georgian-Abkhazian dialogue, in particular on confidence-building measures. The Ministers encourage the parties to follow up the decisions on confidence-building measures and to further study the proposals put forward at the Athens Meeting on Abkhazia, Georgia. If all parties agree to a similar meeting in Istanbul, this may provide a good opportunity. Ministers stress the possible role of the UN/OSCE Human Rights Office in Sukhumi in monitoring and assisting in implementation of any confidence-building measures between the two parties.

While reiterating that reconstruction measures cannot be a substitute for political settlement, Ministers acknowledge the importance of the rehabilitation of the conflict areas and regions and the return of refugees for advancing the process of the conflict settlement. They call on all parties to create conditions appropriate for such measures to be implemented. They undertake to explore the possibilities of a more active OSCE role in this respect in close liaison with international donors and institutions which are already active in this field in Georgia, and as a complement to their activities.

DECISION ON MOLDOVA
(MC(7).DEC/2)

Ministers note that negotiations respecting the status of the Trans-Dniestrian region of Moldova have languished. They call for re-invigorating these negotiations through the facilitation of the OSCE Mission to Moldova and the Russian and Ukrainian mediators. They strongly urge both parties to intensify their discussions aimed at consolidating the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova along with an understanding on a special status for the Trans-Dniestrian region.

They stress the positive role of the peacekeeping forces in securing stability in the region.

Ministers call for full implementation of the relevant OSCE decisions and express concern over the lack of progress in the withdrawal of Russian troops currently stationed in the Republic of Moldova, with the understanding that the removal of Russian armaments, military equipment, ammunition and other ordnance from Moldova should be the primary step in this direction.

To redress these circumstances, Ministers agree that the following small and “do-able” steps could have beneficial consequences for the full resolution of these problems:

(a) with regard to the political settlement of the question of the status of Trans-Dniestria:

- the complete implementation of the confidence- and security-building measures set out in the Odessa Protocols of 20 March 1998;
- the intensification of dialogue on the outstanding issues among relevant authorities and experts from both sides, particularly with regard to the division of competencies as agreed in the Memorandum and in the Joint Declaration of the Presidents of the Russian Federation and Ukraine of 8 May 1997;
- identification and implementation of specific projects in the areas of the environment and economic and cultural relations as well as information flows across the Dniestr River;
- high-level meetings on the Trans-Dniestrian problem;

(b) with regard to military issues:

- consideration of making use of the offers of assistance in solving the environmental problems caused by the presence of unstable munitions;
- consideration of the existing offers of assistance relating to removal and/or destruction of Russian armaments, military equipment, ammunition and other ordnance;
- the elaboration, within a period of six months after the Oslo 1998 OSCE Ministerial Council, of a schedule for the withdrawal of the armaments, military equipment, ammunition and other ordnance;

- completion of the remaining protocols of the Moldo-Russian Agreement of 21 October 1994 on the withdrawal of Russian troops;
 - resumption of the activities of the Mixed Moldo-Russian Commission on military issues.
- (c) with regard to the activities of the OSCE Mission to Moldova:
- consideration of a potential role of the OSCE Mission in ensuring transparency regarding the process of withdrawal of Russian troops.

DECISION ON
A DOCUMENT-CHARTER ON EUROPEAN SECURITY
The Way Ahead
(MC(7).DEC/3)

The Ministerial Council,

Reiterating the will to develop the key role the OSCE is playing within the framework of the emerging European security architecture based on partnership and co-operation,

Welcoming considerable progress in the development of the mutually reinforcing and non-hierarchical co-operation between the OSCE and other organizations and institutions,

Taking note of the on-going operational evolution of the OSCE especially in the fields of early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, comprehensive conflict settlement and post-conflict rehabilitation,

Taking note of the Chairman-in-Office Progress Report on the work on a Document-Charter in 1998 and welcoming what has been achieved to date,

Confirming the political commitment of the OSCE participating States to continue the work with a view to elaborate comprehensive and substantive Document-Charter on European Security, worthy of adoption at the OSCE Summit.

Has agreed that

1. With the aim of completing the work on a Document-Charter in 1999, the Chairman of the Security Model Committee at an early meeting of the Committee will present a work programme for the drafting of a Document-Charter. Drafting will be based on Copenhagen Decision No. 5 and a detailed structure of a Document-Charter, derived from that decision, which will be presented to the SMC by its Chairman by the end of March 1999.

Progress in drafting will be assessed at reinforced PC meetings in 1999.

2. The negotiation on the Document-Charter will build on what has been achieved thus far and will continue to reflect, *inter alia*, practical efforts to strengthen the work of the OSCE in all its dimensions, as well as to develop further co-operation with other organizations and institutions.
3. Further development of the Platform for Co-operative Security, as a part of a Document-Charter, should also include provisions relating to the subregional dimension of security in the OSCE area.

DECISION ON
THE FURTHER OPERATIONAL STRENGTHENING OF THE OSCE
(MC(7).DEC/4)

The Ministerial Council,

Recalling its Decision No. 3 taken last year in Copenhagen,

Welcoming the Permanent Council Decision No. 257 and the Secretary General's report on the implementation of this decision (MC.GAL/1/98/Rev.1 Restr.),

Aware of growing operational activities of the Organization and in particular the build-up of the Kosovo Verification Mission, resulting in a significantly increased workload for the OSCE Secretariat,

Willing to increase the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of the OSCE operations,

Recognizing the need to further strengthen the OSCE capabilities for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation in its area, and in particular the need to enhance the operational capacities of the OSCE Secretariat,

1. Tasks the Permanent Council, as a matter of priority, to consider expeditiously requests of the Secretary General concerning the staffing of the OSCE Secretariat contracted personnel in relation to the need to provide adequate support for enhanced operational activities of the OSCE.
2. Decides that work on further operational strengthening of the OSCE will be considered by the Permanent Council.
3. Further decides that the Permanent Council in mid-1999 will review progress achieved in this respect.
4. Requests the Chairman-in-Office to prepare a progress report, taking into account findings of the Permanent Council meeting referred to above.

DECISION ON
ENHANCEMENT OF THE OSCE'S OPERATIONAL
CAPABILITIES REGARDING ROMA AND SINTI ISSUES
(MC(7).DEC/5)

The Ministerial Council,

Bearing in mind the existing OSCE commitments regarding Roma and Sinti, and

Recalling the decision taken by the Budapest Summit to appoint within the ODIHR a Contact Point for Roma and Sinti (Gypsies) Issues,

1. Decides to enhance the capability of the OSCE regarding those issues by strengthening the existing ODIHR Contact Point for Roma and Sinti Issues. Among its priorities will be:
 - to enhance the OSCE's interaction with the governments of the participating States, with representatives of Roma and Sinti communities, as well as with international organizations, initiatives and NGOs relevant to Roma and Sinti issues, and in particular to secure further mutual reinforcement of co-operation with the Co-ordinator for Roma in the Council of Europe with a view to avoiding duplication of effort, including the establishment of regular consultations with those organizations, initiatives and NGOs in order to develop synergies and common approaches designed to facilitate full integration of Roma and Sinti communities into the societies they live in, while preserving their identity;
 - to enhance co-operation among OSCE institutions and mission/field presences with respect to Roma and Sinti, if applicable;
 - to develop, on the basis of input from participating States, the OSCE institutions, and in particular the HCNM, Roma and Sinti communities, NGOs, and international organizations and other institutions and initiatives, a work programme which should include, *inter alia*, seminars, workshops and clearing houses;
 - to collect information from the participating States on legislative and other measures related to the situation of Roma and Sinti with a view to making it available to the OSCE community, as well as to other interested international organizations, and to elaborating additional reports on the situation of Roma and Sinti in the OSCE area.
2. Further decides that the Contact Point should deal solely with matters concerning Roma and Sinti.
3. Tasks the Permanent Council with devising appropriate ways to ensure adequate resources to implement this decision.

DECISION ON
THE LOCATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE
HIGH COMMISSIONER ON NATIONAL MINORITIES
(MC(7).DEC/6)

The Ministerial Council,

- Accepts with gratitude the commitment of the Netherlands to continue providing the High Commissioner on National Minorities with premises in The Hague and its readiness to renovate, enlarge and refurbish them;
- Affirms its understanding that this commitment, initially covering the period up to and including the year 2004, has been made regardless of the person holding the office of High Commissioner on National Minorities; and
- Notes with appreciation that the commitment represents a significant contribution to the OSCE.

DECISION ON CENTRAL ASIA
(MC(7).DEC/7)

The Ministerial Council,

Expressing its support for the enhancement of the OSCE's activities in Central Asia, among other things through the newly established OSCE Centres in the region,

- Expresses the need for co-ordination among various international organizations and institutions with respect to activities in Central Asia;
- Requests the Chairman-in-Office to prepare a report concerning various possibilities for the OSCE to strengthen this co-ordinated approach;
- Tasks the Permanent Council to consider this report before the summer recess.

DECISION ON
THE CHAIRMANSHIP IN THE YEAR 2000
(MC(7).DEC/8)

The Ministerial Council decides that Austria will exercise the function of the OSCE chairmanship in the year 2000.

IV. CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY

CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY

The OSCE Ministerial Council held its session in Oslo to review the role and activities of the OSCE, and especially the Organization's contribution to meeting current risks and challenges to security.

Discussion at the meeting focused on the OSCE's involvement in Kosovo, the OSCE's role in and contribution to European security, as well as operational capabilities of the Organization. The current stage of negotiation on a Document-Charter on European Security was assessed and specific suggestions were made with regard to the future work on that issue.

Ministers discussed regional conflicts in the OSCE area and the Organization's efforts contributing to their settlement. A number of operational issues relating to the strengthening of the OSCE's activities were considered.

The discussion has found its reflection in the adoption by the Ministers of several documents listed below.

Ministers adopted the Oslo Ministerial Declaration, issued a Statement on Kosovo, and approved the following decisions:

- on Georgia,
- on Moldova,
- on a Document-Charter on European Security: The Way Ahead,
- on the further operational strengthening of the OSCE,
- on the enhancement of the OSCE's capabilities regarding Roma and Sinti issues,
- on the location of the Office of the High Commissioner on National Minorities,
- on Central Asia,
- on the next OSCE Chairmanship,
- on the date of the next OSCE Summit.

The Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, Polish Foreign Minister Bronisław Geremek, submitted to the Ministerial Council his Activity Report for 1998 and a Progress Report on the Development of a Document-Charter on European Security.

In addition to the issues contained in the above-mentioned documents, the Ministers discussed questions reflected in this Summary.

* * * * *

The OSCE Chairman-in-Office made a trip from 23 to 26 November to the countries of the South Caucasus region, including the Republic of Armenia and the Azerbaijani Republic. In the course of his trip, he met with the Presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan as well as the leadership of Nagorno-Karabakh and got acquainted with the

situation in the area of conflict. All parties agree that the OSCE Minsk Process is the only suitable framework for the continuation of the peace process. The parties reiterated their commitment to maintain the cease-fire. Upon the suggestion of the Chairman-in-Office, all parties agreed to an exchange of prisoners of war as one confidence-building measure.

The OSCE Chairman-in-Office has received the report of the Co-Chairs of the Minsk Conference on their efforts in the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh armed conflict. The Chairman-in-Office welcomes the vigorous activity by the Co-Chairs during 1998. He accordingly urges the parties in conflict to resume negotiations in the framework of the OSCE Minsk Group without delay in order to promptly define a mutually acceptable basis for comprehensive settlement of the conflict. He calls also on the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group to continue their efforts to facilitate negotiations and search for a solution. The OSCE Chairman-in-Office expresses the firm conviction that all parties should demonstrate political resolve and a willingness to take into account all legitimate interests and concerns. In this way, through the assistance of the Co-Chairs, this conflict can and should be settled in order to establish lasting peace and stability in the South Caucasus region.

* * * * *

Ministers expressed appreciation of the efforts of the Chairman-in-Office, supported by the OSCE community, with regard to the Kosovo crisis. Concerning the establishment of the Kosovo Verification Mission of the OSCE (KVM) emphasis was put on the extraordinary challenge of this task. Ministers welcomed the use of the Vienna-based ad hoc open-ended committee on Sandjak, Vojvodina and Kosovo as the channel of information regarding the operation of the KVM and conditions in Kosovo as well as the informal venue for the discussion of OSCE decisions with respect to the KVM. In this context, the commitment of the Lisbon Summit was recalled to transparency in action and relations with one another among OSCE States, and how this could be reflected best in OSCE decision making.

* * * * *

Ministers congratulated the parties to the agreements on confidence and security-building measures and sub-regional arms control under Dayton for progress achieved in their implementation and encouraged the further development of co-operation among the parties. They thanked the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office, General Jean, for his contribution to this process.

Satisfaction was expressed about the agreement reached among the interested parties on the mandate for negotiations on regional stabilization, as foreseen under Article V of Annex 1-B of the Dayton Peace Agreement. Ministers thanked the Special Representative of the Chairman-in-Office, Ambassador Jacolin, for the work done on the mandate enabling the negotiation process to start.

* * * * *

The OSCE's important role in Albania was underlined, including in its new function as Co-Chairman, together with the European Union, of the group of "Friends of Albania" in concerting the efforts of concerned countries and international bodies.

Ministers reiterated their support for the OSCE's involvement in Belarus, in particular in helping the authorities there to comply with their OSCE commitments. They stressed the

importance of constructive co-operation between the OSCE Advisory and Monitoring Group and the host country.

Ministers appreciated the work of the OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya, Russian Federation. The personnel of the Group deserve special praise for carrying out tasks in a very insecure environment where hostage-takings are a matter of continuous and grave concern.

The readiness of the OSCE to contribute, through its mission, to progress in the peace process in Tajikistan was reiterated.

During the discussion the hope was expressed that Kazakhstan will work closely with the OSCE, including on how to improve its electoral processes.

* * * * *

While reviewing the operational activities of the OSCE, including these of the missions and institutions, the Ministers commended OSCE personnel for outstanding work and stressed the different nature of tasks carried out in the field by the OSCE, ranging from preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention to post-conflict rehabilitation and promotion of dialogue and co-operation.

Ministers stressed the importance they attach to the effectiveness of the OSCE's operational activities. Acknowledging the challenge posed to the OSCE by growing field operations, they thanked the Secretary General for his report on the implementation of OSCE decisions on the enhancement of operational capacities of the Secretariat.

Ministers stressed the importance of the implementation of the Common Concept for the Development of Mutually-Reinforcing Institutions. They assessed the co-operation between the OSCE and other international organizations and institutions as developing very well.

The OSCE Court of Conciliation and Arbitration was referred to as one of the means for peaceful settlement of disputes. Ministers stressed that the signature and ratification of the 1992 Stockholm Convention on Conciliation and Arbitration within the OSCE, establishing the court, would contribute to the use of this instrument.

During the discussion organizational and financial aspects of the functioning of the OSCE were touched upon.

* * * * *

Ministers emphasized that the work in the human dimension and democracy building, extending to the individual, plays a crucial role for comprehensive security. They commended in this regard the excellent work carried out by the High Commissioner on National Minorities, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, and the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media. Special gratitude was expressed to Mr. Max van der Stoel for his readiness to continue to serve as High Commissioner.

The need for improvement in the compliance with and implementation of all commitments in the human dimension did not diminish, in particular with respect to human rights and fundamental freedoms, including rights of persons belonging to national minorities. Ministers referred, *inter alia*, to the standing commitment of the OSCE to address

problems of continuing violations of human rights, such as involuntary migration, threats to independent media, electoral fraud, manifestations of aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism. Unreserved condemnation of all acts and practices of terrorism was expressed as well as the commitment for enhanced co-operation to eliminate that threat to security, democracy and human rights.

In the human dimension stress was laid specifically on the need to better accommodate persons belonging to national minorities within State borders, the importance of their effective participation in public decision making, and the enhancement of harmonious coexistence of minorities and majority populations. Problems of statelessness were touched upon. Ministers recalled OSCE commitments regarding equal opportunities between men and women. They agreed to continue to pursue the objective of full and true equality between men and women as a fundamental aspect of a just and democratic society.

* * * * *

In discussions concerning the economic dimension, reference was made to the need for further promotion of free market economies and social progress, economic and environmental co-operation throughout the OSCE region. The need for the elimination of discrimination in trade, and of barriers to the movement of persons, goods, services, capital and information in accordance with relevant norms and agreements was mentioned. Ministers welcomed the activities of the Co-ordinator of the OSCE Economic and Environmental activities.

* * * * *

Referring to the threats posed by the uncontrolled accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons, several Ministers noted with satisfaction the launching of discussion in the Forum for Security Co-operation context on how the OSCE can best contribute to meeting this challenge, without duplicating existing initiatives. They welcomed the envisaged entry into force on 1 March 1999 of the Ottawa Convention on the ban of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel landmines and on their destruction, drawing attention to the humanitarian significance thereof.

* * * * *

With reference to co-operation between the OSCE and the Mediterranean partners for co-operation relevant provisions of the OSCE Budapest Document 1994 were recalled in the context of positive experience of the activities of the Vienna-based Mediterranean Contact Group, the well-established tradition of Mediterranean seminars and regular high-level consultation of the OSCE Troika and the partners.

* * * * *

Ministers expressed their deep gratitude to the Government of Norway for the excellent organization of the Ministerial Council Meeting.

V. REPORTS TO THE
OSLO MINISTERIAL COUNCIL MEETING

CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE'S
ACTIVITY REPORT FOR 1998

1. During 1998 the OSCE's contribution to European security underwent a process of qualitative refinement and enlargement in rapid response to risks and challenges. The Organization's political mission of enhancing peace and stability in the OSCE area through consolidation of common values, broadly understood conflict prevention and promotion of co-operative security has been constantly put to the test by the challenges posed by existing and emerging potential conflict. Activities aimed at furthering compliance with OSCE principles and commitments continued to be a responsibility requiring great attention by the Organization.
2. The OSCE faced a variable and complex security environment that mobilized the development of its operational capabilities and stimulated its mission of creating solidarity and partnership among participating States in meeting common challenges. The evolving crisis in Kosovo challenged the OSCE's abilities to adapt itself adequately to the requirements of conflict prevention. While the institutions and numerous missions of the OSCE continued to pursue their tasks, the Organization expanded its presence in Central Asia and created conditions for similar enhancement in Transcaucasus. The commitment of the OSCE to refining its role within a non-hierarchical security system for Europe resulted in the active consideration of a future OSCE Charter on European Security. This consideration was backed up by the development of dynamic co-operation with other international organizations and institutions, furthering their mutual reinforcement in pursuit of common goals and objectives.
3. During 1998 the OSCE has been reaffirming its key role in fostering security and stability by applying instruments for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. Long-term missions and representatives of the OSCE in the field have continued to serve throughout the area as effective, responsive and flexible tools of preventive and mitigating action in the face of the manifold risks and challenges to security and stability. The OSCE has continued to prove its reliability as a mechanism for promoting dialogue, solidarity, partnership and co-operation. It has maintained its focus on aiding the implementation of basic principles and commitments, including the fundamental aspects of greater respect for human rights and the building of democracy.
4. In all its endeavours the OSCE has been working closely together with relevant international organizations and institutions. This co-operation, based on the Common Concept for the Development of Co-operation between Mutually-Reinforcing Institutions, as defined by the 1997 Copenhagen OSCE Ministerial Council, has been guided by the principles of pragmatism, responsible burden-sharing and the use of the comparative advantages of all the actors involved. The range of OSCE contacts with its partner organizations and institutions in 1998 was unprecedented, both at the headquarters level and in the field. It encompassed, in addition to the activities of the Chairman-in-Office, those of the OSCE institutions and of its missions and representatives throughout the OSCE area.
5. The operational activities of the OSCE in 1998 included the consolidation and adjustment of activities as well as the assumption of new mandates. In addition to several continuing efforts, operations of a new type, such as compliance verification and police monitoring, have been initiated by the OSCE, leading to the defining of new potential capabilities in the Organization's conflict prevention role. In the field of preventive

diplomacy and in contributions to crisis management and post-rehabilitation efforts, stress was laid on early warning on risks and challenges.

6. Eight months elapsed in 1998 before the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) was persuaded by the international community to cease warfare in Kosovo and to start withdrawing in substantial numbers its special forces from the province. Subsequent resolutions of the United Nations Security Council (Nos. 1160, 1199 and 1203) reflected and defined the international community's positions on the Kosovo crisis and the requirements for FRY compliance. It was nevertheless only the threat of military intervention that prevented Belgrade from continuing its pacification activities in the province with its toll of death and displacement for many civilians. The OSCE reacted immediately to Serb repression of the ethnic Albanian population in Kosovo. This was reflected in the statement issued by its Chairman-in-Office on 2 March, followed by an action plan of the Chairman-in-Office for Kosovo and the Permanent Council Decision No. 218 urging the FRY to halt its excessive use of force in the province and to initiate a genuine dialogue with Kosovo Albanian representatives. The Chairman-in-Office also pointed to the need to draw up status proposals on Kosovo and to hold round-table talks in the FRY with international participation as crucial aspects of the search for political solutions. The OSCE continuously pursued the objectives of reinstating the mission of the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office, Mr. Felipe González, and of ensuring a permanent OSCE presence in the FRY, including Kosovo. For several months the Chairman-in-Office maintained dialogue on the level of ambassadors with Yugoslav authorities on the question of the FRY's participation in the OSCE. Such participation was, however, used by the FRY as a condition for the return of the OSCE to the country, a demand that led to the suspension of the talks. Pursuant to Security Council resolution No. 1160, the Chairman-in-Office began providing to the United Nations monthly information on the situation in Kosovo and on the measures taken by the OSCE in response to that crisis. In March the OSCE strengthened its field presence in Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in order to make its monitoring efforts more effective.

7. In the autumn of 1998 intense negotiations between the United States special envoy, Mr. Richard Holbrooke, and Belgrade led to the acceptance by the FRY of political talks and brokerage between the parties to the Kosovo conflict. Agreement was reached on the establishment of a regime to verify compliance by the FRY with the requirements of the international community. The OSCE showed itself ready to contribute to the concerted international effort to put an end to violence in Kosovo through the establishment of the Kosovo Verification Mission in October. The relevant Agreement signed on 16 October in Belgrade by the Chairman-in-Office and the FRY has opened fresh prospects for an end to repression in Kosovo and the start of a return to political dialogue between the parties to the conflict. At the same time, the OSCE has been faced with the extraordinary task of organizing a huge and unprecedented verification operation, thus opening a qualitatively new chapter in OSCE conflict prevention activities.

8. During 1998 the OSCE continued to fulfil the role assigned to it under the Dayton General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (GFAP). Both confidence- and security-building measures under Article II and the sub-regional arms control under Article IV of Annex 1-B to the GFAP were consolidated. The work on the mandate for negotiation on regional stabilization under Article V was advanced towards acceptance. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the OSCE contributed significantly to the efforts of the international community with regard to the consolidation of State structures, democracy building and human rights implementation. This was done in line with the recommendations of the Peace Implementation Council (PIC). While OSCE tasks in connection with the

general elections held in September were in the forefront of the activities of its mission, further support was provided through action on behalf of democratization, human rights including those of returnees, and the build-up and functioning of democratic institutions such as the office of the ombudsman. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the complementary nature and the mutual reinforcement of the activities of different international organizations and institutions have been proving their value. The OSCE's contribution to the preparation and carrying out of the elections in that country proved to be on the right track, in light of the fact that the voters there have opted for a more pluralistic political spectrum. The dedication of the OSCE election personnel deserves high praise.

9. The continuous presence of the OSCE mission in Croatia has been contributing to the strengthening of that country's efforts in the fields of post-war confidence building, return of refugees, and the further development of democratic standards. The implementation of international obligations by Croatia was a precondition for OSCE assistance to government and local authorities as work continued towards furthering tolerance, reconciliation, the rule of law and a civil society. The OSCE embarked on a new mandate in Croatia and a new dimension in the development of its own capabilities through the establishment of a police monitoring operation in the Danubian region of that country. The assumption by the OSCE of the tasks and responsibilities of the United Nations Police Support Group in the Danubian region was completed in October 1998. Integrating the Serb local community into Croatian society and ensuring sustainable implementation of the refugee return programme continued to remain challenging tasks, as did assistance in drafting legislation covering human rights, the judiciary, the media and elections.

10. The prevailing political instability in Albania challenged the OSCE to increase its determination and efforts to assist that country in fostering political dialogue and the amalgamation of democracy and the rule of law through the strengthening of its institutions. This goal was pursued jointly with other international organizations and institutions. The OSCE continued to provide a flexible co-ordinating framework for international support for Albania, *inter alia*, in its new role as co-chairman, together with the European Union, of the group of "Friends of Albania", which brings together concerned countries and international bodies and was established in September 1998. The international ministerial conference on Albania held in October in Tirana with the participation of the OSCE welcomed the comprehensive reform programme presented by the Government and laid down a number of priorities for the stabilization and development of the country. The subsequent strengthening of the OSCE Presence in Albania demonstrated the Organization's resolve to continue its assistance efforts. Earlier in the year a monitoring component was established as part of the Presence for the purpose of providing analysis of the situation in Kosovo and on the border between Albania and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

11. The mandate of the OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje has been implemented with a view to supporting sustainable internal stability in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which has been jeopardized in an unpredictable way by the crisis in neighbouring Kosovo. The situation in the country has remained stable and calm in the course of 1998, allowing the OSCE mission to concentrate its work on co-operation with the Government in promoting the internal aspects of stability, including respect for human rights, elections and economic opportunities.

12. The OSCE's Advisory and Monitoring Group in Belarus pursued a constructive dialogue with the Government and representatives of different segments of Belarusian society on a number of issues relating to the building of democratic institutions and civic society. The Group offered advice regarding the drafting of electoral legislation, the establishment of

an ombudsman's office, the penal code and the code of criminal procedure, and also regarding projects regarded by the Group as important, such as the legislative project on the electronic media. The Group also monitored compliance with international commitments in the fields of human rights, the rule of law and democracy building, acting as a catalyst for democratic values and projects between governmental and non-governmental forces in Belarus. In spite of great efforts, meaningful progress was difficult to achieve. A round-table to overcome the constitutional crisis would be instrumental to promote democracy in Belarus. Belarus should play its role as a democratic member of European organizations. This would also lead to the full observance of human rights in Belarus.

13. During this year the withdrawal of Russian troops, ammunition and equipment from the Trans-Dniestrian region of Moldova as well as an overall political settlement to the conflict over Trans-Dniestria have been issues of concern to the OSCE. This long-standing commitment to a search for solutions to both questions was reflected in the holding by the OSCE of meetings on military transparency and political issues in July and October of 1998. Offers of practical assistance in the destruction of ammunition and continued attachment to an approach to the problem of troop withdrawal based on sequenced, achievable steps have been remaining at the focus of the OSCE's attention. The contributions of Russia and Ukraine as mediators to efforts aimed at the political solution of the conflict over Trans-Dniestria should be noted.

14. The 1998 year saw continuing positive political transformation in Georgia towards a more open and democratic society and movement towards a market economy. There was some progress in the search for a peaceful settlement of the conflict over South Ossetia/Tskhinvali region, in particular with regard to the military security situation and the return of refugees and internally displaced persons. However, no meaningful progress was achieved with respect to a peaceful solution of the conflict over Abkhazia, Georgia, although the search for a settlement has been stepped up and there are some grounds for optimism.

15. The OSCE continued its efforts to advance the work of resolving the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. The co-chairmen of the Minsk Group continued their work with the parties with a view to an early resumption of negotiations. The monitoring of the line of contact by the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office and his staff was essential for the consolidation of the cease-fire regime and for building confidence between the parties.

16. The visit of the Chairman-in-Office to the Caucasus in November underscored the importance the OSCE has been attaching to its continuing efforts to bring about a peaceful resolution of conflicts in that region. In Georgia the Chairman-in-Office emphasized the OSCE's long-standing commitment to work, through its mission, for the advancement of a political settlement of the South Ossetian conflict and to contribute to confidence building between the parties to the dispute on the future status of Abkhazia. The possibility of the opening of an OSCE office in the Gali region was also discussed. As regards Nagorno-Karabakh, the Chairman-in-Office called on the parties concerned to demonstrate the political will to negotiate and compromise in the interest of achieving a mutually acceptable and mutually advantageous resolution of the conflict. An exchange of prisoners of war was agreed during the visit. Furthermore, Armenia and Azerbaijan gave positive response to the suggestion of the Chairman-in-Office to establish OSCE offices in Erevan and Baku. The Chairman-in-Office signed memoranda of understanding between the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and the three countries aimed at deepening co-operation in the fields of democracy and human rights.

17. The OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya, Russian Federation, continued to support and facilitate humanitarian assistance and to monitor the evolving internal situation including respect for human rights. The OSCE was the only international organization present in Chechnya. Developments there do not provide ground for optimism. The frequent kidnappings there are a matter of grave and continuing security concern. The extremely complex situation in Chechnya remained a major obstacle to the work of the Assistance Group, leading, among other problems, to temporary difficulties in ensuring the appropriate level of staffing in Grozny and its permanent presence there.

18. The OSCE assisted in the task of national reconciliation in Tajikistan, among other ways by providing advice on the development of legal and democratic political institutions and processes. The OSCE continued its monitoring of the human rights situation, thereby promoting compliance with OSCE principles and commitments in Tajikistan. It should be noted that although there has been some progress in the implementation of the peace agreement, implementation of the vast majority of the protocols is behind schedule.

19. In April the Chairman-in-Office paid visits to Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. These visits confirmed the willingness of the host countries to advance their integration within the framework of OSCE principles and activities, a long with their desire, shared by all participating States, to strengthen the OSCE community. The implementation of the Chairman-in-Office's recommendations drawn from his trip to Central Asia led to the establishment of OSCE centres in Almaty, Ashgabad and Bishkek. This gives the OSCE and the countries involved a unique opportunity to intensify co-operation in all relevant spheres, including the economic, environmental, human and political aspects of security, and with a view to strengthening regional links and stability, and preventing the emergence of risks and challenges to stability. The human dimension aspects of co-operation have been reinforced through memoranda of understanding between ODIHR and, respectively, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. The memoranda were signed by the Chairman-in-Office at the Ministerial Council meeting in Oslo.

20. OSCE activities in Ukraine concentrated mainly on human rights and economic projects aimed at assisting in the implementation of OSCE principles and commitments by strengthening and stimulating the process of overall democratization in the country. Clear progress in carrying out the mandate of the OSCE Mission to Ukraine has resulted in serious consideration being given to the scope and modalities of future co-operation between the OSCE representation in Ukraine and the host country authorities.

21. The OSCE missions to Estonia and Latvia continued to perform several useful and concrete functions as agencies promoting and assisting social integration in both countries. By pursuing this goal and contributing to the implementation of a number of related projects, they have had a stabilizing effect on interethnic relations. OSCE representatives in Estonia and Latvia continued to assist the relevant governmental and inter-governmental bodies in solving problems relating to the legal status and situation of Russian military pensioners in both countries. In August, in line with the relevant bilateral agreement between Latvia and the Russian Federation signed in 1994, the Skrunda radar station in Latvia was switched off, marking the beginning of the dismantling of that installation. The Skrunda radar inspection regime, established by the OSCE at the request of the parties, and the work of its representative in the relevant joint commission contributed to the success of this task undertaken by the OSCE.

22. While consolidating and developing its operational activities, the OSCE was actively engaged, pursuant to the decisions of the 1997 Copenhagen Ministerial Council, in preparing

a Document-Charter on European Security. Considerable progress was achieved in this work, as noted in a separate report. This progress allows the OSCE ministers gathering in Oslo to call on the incoming Chairman-in-Office to organize the drafting of the future document with the aim of adopting it at the next meeting of the Heads of State or Government of the OSCE participating States. The OSCE's partner organizations and institutions played an active part in the development of the concept of a Platform on Co-operative Security, which is aimed at strengthening the mutually reinforcing character of the relationships in place among organizations and institutions concerned with the promotion of comprehensive and co-operative security within the OSCE area.

23. As regards human dimension issues in 1998, apart from assistance in comprehensive implementation of commitments, the OSCE put strong emphasis on the supervision and monitoring of elections. Co-operation between the ODIHR and the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE on electoral observation was strengthened and improved in several cases through joint efforts with the Council of Europe. The new methodology for electoral assistance and observation developed by the ODIHR, which includes the monitoring of the entire election process, has proven to be efficient and reliable in terms of assessing compliance with OSCE commitments. Numerous projects were prepared and run by the ODIHR in co-operation with several OSCE missions and other international and national institutions. They strengthened the role of the OSCE in the promotion of democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights, and helped in the build-up and consolidation of democratic institutions in several participating States. The modalities for OSCE implementation meetings on human dimension issues, agreed upon in July, helped to integrate more closely the human dimension into the daily work of the OSCE and also to increase the contributions of relevant inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations to OSCE activities. The Warsaw meeting on human dimension issues held in October-November provided a framework for thorough discussion of compliance with OSCE commitments. The OSCE developed further, through the ODIHR and in other ways, its role vis-à-vis the regional conference on problems of migration in and around the Commonwealth of Independent States, and it focused particular attention on issues of equality of opportunity between men and women. The OSCE worked on formulating a more effective response to the problems of Roma and Sinti ethnic groups.

24. The High Commissioner on National Minorities continued to contribute to the promotion of comprehensive security in the OSCE area, especially in regions where tensions involving national minorities might have potential consequences for peace and stability. The range of the High Commissioner's activities was very broad and concentrated on efforts aimed at assisting Governments in responding to the political and human rights aspirations of persons belonging to national minorities. Among the numerous initiatives to this end it is worth while mentioning the international conference on "Governance and Participation: Integrating Diversity" organized in October in Locarno. Benefits of decentralization and subsidiarity as means of accommodating diversity in society and, ultimately, of contributing to the resolution of minority-related issues, were discussed.

25. The Office of the OSCE Representative on the Freedom of Media became operational in the first quarter of 1998. The OSCE media representative has established an extensive network of contacts with Governments and with international and non-governmental organizations and is co-operating constructively, *inter alia*, with the Council of Europe and the ODIHR. The work of the Office has focused primarily on early warning activities and on rapid response to serious cases of non-compliance with OSCE commitments regarding freedom of expression and the media.

26. OSCE activities in the economic dimension have been intensified during the year. The Co-ordinator for Economic and Environmental Activities has begun to implement actively his mandate. This has resulted in much closer OSCE co-operation with the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and the European Commission, and in better interaction with the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE. An expanded network of contacts with non-governmental organizations and the private sector has also been put into place. The successful Sixth Meeting of the Economic Forum held in June of this year in Prague, along with the regional seminars organized in the run-up to next year's Economic Forum, helped to raise the profile of the Organization's economic dimension.

27. In 1998 the OSCE has reinforced its network of co-operation channels with other international organizations and institutions. A number of high-level consultations on specific subjects have been held during the year. These have led to operational conclusions and the strengthening of co-operation frameworks involving OSCE institutions and missions. The OSCE has strengthened its role as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, through, *inter alia* the establishment of the Kosovo Verification Mission which has been endorsed by the United Nations Security Council. Memoranda on co-operation were concluded between the Secretary General of the OSCE and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the ODIHR and the UNHCR, and the ODIHR and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The OSCE maintained close co-operation and held consultations with several United Nations agencies, the Council of Europe and NATO. The Kosovo Verification Mission of the OSCE became an important testing ground for co-operation between the OSCE and NATO. The information exchange among international organizations and institutions has increased, with the OSCE in a position to provide useful data thanks to its strong field presence.

28. In accordance with the relevant decision of the Copenhagen Ministerial Council Meeting, a group of experts was established in the OSCE to review possible ways of further enhancing the Secretariat's operational capacities. As a result of its work several relevant problems were defined and recommendations set out on how best to approach them. Based thereon decisions were taken on adjustments to the structure of the Secretariat, carried out by the Secretary General. During 1998 the OSCE devised a "strategy for capacity-building and training for conflict prevention and human rights". This strategy is aimed at improving the ability of OSCE institutions and missions to carry out their mandates, to strengthen their internal performance, and in this way to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of OSCE activities. The strategy envisages a number of short- and long-term measures in pursuit of its objective. The challenge of the Kosovo Verification Mission requires an appropriate response in terms not only of the continuing reform of the OSCE Secretariat but also of adequate training.

29. In 1998 the OSCE maintained and developed good contacts and co-operation with the partners for co-operation - Japan and Korea. The partner's continued interest in OSCE activities and work was recognized. Their contribution and willingness to sustain it in support of the efforts of the international community, including the OSCE, in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Kosovo is highly appreciated. In May the OSCE welcomed Jordan as a new Mediterranean Partner for Co-operation. Co-operation between the Mediterranean partners and the OSCE participating States has been stepped up during the year in the framework of monthly meetings of a Contact Group that brings all of them together and serves as a useful instrument of dialogue and exchange. The OSCE invited the Mediterranean partners to send their representatives on visits to its missions and to participate

in election monitoring operations organized by it. This year's OSCE Mediterranean seminar was regarded by all who took part as another significant element in the dialogue between the Organization and the partners.

30. During the year the Chairmanship followed the guidelines governing the method of work that had been submitted by the Chairman-in-Office to the Permanent Council on 15 January. Efforts were undertaken to strengthen existing interaction and complementarity between the OSCE and other international organizations dealing with European security. The number of contacts established and the numerous forms of interaction demonstrate that this goal has become a reality. Another aim was to make the early warning system more effective. The flow of early warning information within the OSCE framework in 1998 can be regarded as good. However, the capability to process that information and the linkages permitting co-ordinated action once early warning has been received needs further improvement, even though expedient holding of special plenary sessions of the Permanent Council in Vienna on short notice was used quite frequently. The idea of conducting periodic, brief evaluations of OSCE activities was implemented to a limited extent (reinforced meetings of the Permanent Council) and deserves further study. Furthermore, it was the Chairmanship's intention to preserve a multidimensional system of consultations in the OSCE in keeping with the democratic nature of this Organization. Here, the record is quite satisfactory, considering the number of informal open-ended and bilateral consultations held.

31. It is worth while pointing out that during this year the Chairman-in-Office and the Chairmanship established very close co-operation with the Secretary General and the OSCE Secretariat, as well other OSCE institutions and representatives in the field. The co-operation within the OSCE "Troika" worked well. The Chairman-in-Office paid official visits to Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. These visits as well as consultations in several other countries provided an opportunity to discuss matters of interest to the Organization.

CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE'S PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WORK IN 1998 ON A DOCUMENT-CHARTER ON EUROPEAN SECURITY

The OSCE occupies a key place in the new system of security in Europe and has an important role to play in meeting new risks and challenges to security as an organization specializing in conflict prevention, broadly understood. It is also a source of norms and principles, a promoter of the notion of comprehensive and indivisible security and the organizer of an integrative and flexible framework for co-operation among different organizations and institutions.

To perform effectively this new role, the OSCE has to be equipped with new tools. The work on the Document-Charter on European Security is therefore of particular importance.

SUMMARY OF MAIN ACTIVITIES

The basis for the work within the Security Model Committee under the Polish Chairmanship was Copenhagen Decision No. 5 on Guidelines on an OSCE Document-Charter on European Security. In accordance with this Decision, two additional working groups have been established in order to deal with specific elements of the Document-Charter. In addition, the Security Model Committee was given the task of conducting negotiations on other issues not covered by the working groups.

All the specific elements referred to in the Copenhagen Decision No. 5 were discussed thoroughly. The basis for the debates within the working groups were working papers prepared by the chairmen of both groups. These working papers are based on proposals tabled earlier. Thanks to this approach, discussions on the Document-Charter entered a qualitatively new stage, i.e., substantive, organized and structured exchanges of views and deliberations on the content of the future Document-Charter.

This method of work seems to have achieved its main purposes: the advancement of goal-oriented discussions, the delineation of areas of emerging common understanding and the identification of the most difficult problems.

The chronology of work on the Document-Charter in 1998 is contained in Annex 1.

On a number of issues considerable progress was achieved. At the same time, significant differences of opinion on many questions were registered. The common understanding is, however, that at this juncture there is a need to turn gradually the discussions into a joint drafting process.

In the view of the Chairmanship, the drafting process would be facilitated by adoption of the structure of the Charter, based on the work done so far. This is why an indicative and non-exhaustive table of contents of the future Charter has been presented by the Chairman-in-Office. In addition, the Chairman-in-Office, in co-operation with the Troika, has prepared a comprehensive vision on the basic framework of the Charter, which is contained in Annex 2. This Annex illustrates a very significant negotiating progress, which has been achieved in the course of 1998.

In accordance with the Copenhagen Decision, the Chairman-in Office, in co-operation with the Secretary General, has been called upon, pending the elaboration of the Platform for

Co-operative Security as part of Document-Charter, to work actively to step up the OSCE's co-operation with international organizations and institutions, basing his activities on the Common Concept adopted in Copenhagen. During the Polish Chairmanship it was possible to intensify further the OSCE's co-operation with a number of international organizations and institutions. The non-exhaustive list of OSCE contacts in this respect is contained in Annex 3. This list illustrates the intensity and comprehensive character of the OSCE's practical co-operation with other organizations and institutions in 1998. At the same time, the principal partners of the OSCE took a very active part in the elaboration of the concept of a "Platform for Co-operative Security". Among the most important events in this regard were two informal meetings of the Security Model Committee with the participation of representatives of international organizations and institutions. Both these meetings provided an opportunity for a discussion of the experience gained from co-operation and contacts in the past, with a particular focus on co-operation in the field. They emphasized the need for pragmatic co-operation, based on the principle of using comparative advantages. At the same time, there was agreement that co-operation needed to be based on the principle of the equal status of the various organizations and the recognition of their distinctive characteristics.

SPECIFIC ISSUES

New risks and challenges to security

The basic working assumption was that the Document-Charter should offer a framework and general principles for identifying new risks and challenges to security, and that in so doing the participating States should consider what ought to be the appropriate role of the OSCE, including how it can best facilitate international efforts in tackling those new risks and challenges. Another assumption was that participating States should, in this context, continue to be guided by a comprehensive concept of security, the indivisibility of security and the principle that no OSCE participating State should seek to enhance its own security at the expense of another.

A common understanding started to emerge that, in view of the evolving nature of new risks and challenges in a changing security environment, an all-inclusive definition is probably neither possible nor desirable. In this context, it was noted that the Lisbon Summit Declaration as well as the Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model and the Copenhagen Ministerial Decision on guidelines for a Document-Charter, identify a number of new risks and challenges.

It has been suggested that a number of issues should be added to those mentioned in the Lisbon and Copenhagen Documents. These suggestions need to be discussed further.

It was also emphasized that other international organizations were already dealing with many of the issues relating to new risks and challenges. The point has been made that unnecessary duplication should be avoided, and the question raised what added value the OSCE could give to the efforts already being undertaken by other international organizations. A number of suggestions have been made as to what role the OSCE could play in dealing with new risks and challenges. These suggestions need further examination.

Politico-military aspects of security

Agreement was reached to the effect that politico-military aspects, including arms control, are integral to the OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative concept of security. Full implementation and further development of arms control agreements and confidence- and security-building measures are essential for enhancing political and military stability and security.

There is an emerging common understanding regarding the idea that, when considering any possible new measures for enhancing transparency, predictability and co-operation, participating States should be guided by the continuing importance of existing agreements. Building on the results achieved, with a view to strengthening the security of all participating States, future work on arms control, confidence- and security-building measures and on other politico-military aspects should not only address new and emerging challenges but also promote greater transparency, openness and co-operation in the politico-military field.

Although they have not gained consensus, proposals have been put forward with a view to ensuring that States refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on territories where they are not now present, establishing nuclear-free zones in the OSCE area, and guaranteeing the security of participating States that are not members of a military alliance.

Early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation

There was a common understanding that early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation are priority objectives in enhancing security and stability in the OSCE area. As a regional arrangement within the terms of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, the OSCE is an organization of first resort for the peaceful settlement of disputes within its area. That is why it is of particular importance to continue efforts to further enhance the OSCE effectiveness as a primary instrument for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

In discussions the participants stressed the need to assure conditions permitting full use of all available mechanisms and instruments. In this context, it was specifically noted that the early warning system needs further improvement and consolidation, *inter alia*, by ensuring the comprehensive analysis of all early warning signals received from different institutions and missions/field operations.

Discussions were initiated on a number of issues, including the relevance of systematizing of available instruments, mechanisms and procedures, establishing of a list of their possible tasks and purposes, and adopting general rules regarding their mandates. Ideas were also expressed about the need to change current procedures for the appointment of the heads of OSCE operations in the field, the role of the Chairman-in-Office in the management of such operations, reporting procedures used by heads of operations' and recruitment of staff.

It was also pointed out that, when working together with humanitarian organizations, the OSCE should take into account the distinctive character of those organizations. The need to establish principles guiding such joint work, such as a humane attitude, impartiality and non-discrimination, was also underlined.

It was impossible to finalize discussions on all these issues because of very significant differences of opinion among participating States.

Expression was also given to the need to improve the training of personnel involved in activities having to do with early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, among other ways by establishing of a system to which partner organizations of the OSCE might contribute, especially in their main areas of specialization.

The OSCE role with regard to police operations

Discussion participants pointed out that OSCE police operations can make an important contribution to building and consolidating democracy and promoting the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Such operations also contribute to the “uniqueness” of the Organization and are consistent with its role as a primary instrument in conflict prevention, crisis management and post conflict rehabilitation, in conformity with Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

A common understanding was reached that the OSCE should develop capabilities that would allow for the provision of appropriate assistance in police activities if requested by any participating State, and that there is a need to consider the usefulness of including a police component in all present and future OSCE missions/field presences.

Considerable progress was achieved with regard to identifying possible forms of OSCE involvement in police operations and the principles on which such operations should be based. There was agreement that the OSCE should be active primarily in the monitoring of local police forces to ensure, *inter alia*, that human rights and fundamental freedoms are protected, that it should organize different forms of training, including “Training of Trainers” programmes, and that it should develop mechanisms to advise local police forces, on issues including the strengthening of law and order and the maintenance of a safe and stable environment. There were also suggestions that the OSCE should be ready to conduct more robust operations.

The need for strict compliance by the OSCE police missions with the norms and principles of the OSCE and with international law, and in particular with international humanitarian law and the provisions of the United Nations Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, was stressed.

On a few issues it has not so far been possible to reach a common understanding. Opinions differ on whether OSCE police operations should be seen as a multidisciplinary task in the context of the Platform for Co-operative Security. Furthermore, differences emerged with regard to the need to establish a chain of command different from that of other missions/field operations, and on issues relating to the exact terms of operation mandates.

Assistance in adherence to/implementation of principles, norms and commitments

There was a common understanding that compliance with OSCE principles, norms and commitments contributes to the creation of a common and indivisible security space and increases the security of all OSCE participating States. Furthermore, it was underlined that respect for commitments, including the willingness of each participating State to enhance its compliance and remain open to OSCE institutions in this regard, is an essential aspect of co-operative security.

Discussions focused on three main topics: action in case of identification of non-compliance, assistance in enhancing compliance, and measures in cases where efforts to enhance implementation are unsuccessful.

On the first topic, there was an agreement regarding the need to involve all OSCE institutions in the monitoring of compliance with OSCE principles, norms and commitments. The need to establish a mechanism through which cases of alleged non-compliance could be clarified and discussed was also stressed.

There was also broad agreement that all the participating States as well as all OSCE structures and institutions should provide appropriate assistance to States experiencing difficulties in meeting their OSCE commitments. In this context, emphasis was placed on the need to make full use of all the existing instruments and procedures.

It was not possible to reach a consensus on the nature of the OSCE action the OSCE should take in the case of clear, gross and uncorrected violation of OSCE principles by a participating State. Two main views were advanced. One was that the OSCE should apply punitive measures, including a recommendation to participating States to suspend political, economic and other kinds of co-operation with the State in question, a decision to refer the matter to the United Nations Security Council, with a possible recommendation for the imposition of sanctions, denial of the violating State's right to speak in the deliberations of the Permanent Council or its subsidiary organs, and the denial of the rights to participate in the decision-making proceedings of the Permanent Council. The other view is that the OSCE should use exclusively co-operative measures.

Jointly considered actions

The main assumption in the work on this issue was that in the event of threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any OSCE participating State or in case of internal breakdown of law and order on the territory of any participating State, timely and immediate reaction by participating States is required. There was also agreement regarding the fact that the participating States should explore possibilities of co-ordinating their actions in such cases with other security-related organizations in the OSCE area.

It was also stressed that any action undertaken by the OSCE and/or its participating States will be without prejudice to the overriding responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for maintaining peace and international security.

Agreement was registered that any action in case of internal breakdown of law and order that might include, *inter alia*, consultation, discussions in various bodies of the OSCE, OSCE mediation, as well as co-ordinated responses, in particular within the terms of Chapter III of the Helsinki Document 1992, including responses as regards peacekeeping

activities, must be in conformity with OSCE norms and principles, and in particular with the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of a participating State.

With regard to cases of threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any participating State, it was stressed that the participating States should take any necessary action jointly and promptly, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in particular its Article 51.

A common understanding was reached that participating States should withhold assistance or support to States that fail to meet their obligation to refrain from threat or use of force, that participating States will act jointly to ensure that the State threatening or using force is held accountable to the OSCE and/or the international community, and that participating States should consider cases of threat or use of force in the competent political, security and defence organizations of which they are members.

There was no agreement as to whether the decision to jointly refer a dispute to the United Nations Security Council on behalf of the OSCE whenever, in the opinion of participating States, action by the Security Council may be required, in particular within the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, may be taken, if necessary, in the absence of the consent of the States or State party to the dispute. It was a common understanding, however that participating States should provide collective support, in addition to the required individual support, for such measures as may be adopted by the United Nations Security Council.

Human dimension

During the debate it was underlined that the human dimension is at the core of the OSCE's comprehensive concept of security. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are recognized as being of direct concern to all participating States and it is agreed that the comprehensive approach to security requires improvements in the implementation of all commitments in the human dimension.

It was also reaffirmed that human dimension commitments are directly applicable and that participating States are accountable for their failure to respect the commitments they undertake.

The need for close co-operation with other relevant international organizations according to the "Platform for Co-operative Security" concept was also underlined.

The main topics which were addressed in discussions were democracy building, elections, national minorities, refugees/migration/migrant workers and institutional issues.

It was possible to make significant progress on most concrete provisions. However, considerable differences persist on questions relating to persons belonging to national minorities.

Economic and environmental issues

The common view in discussions has been that economic and environmental questions should never be considered in isolation or for their own sake but rather as an integral part of the efforts being made in connection with early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. This is why the participating States should take the steps necessary to ensure early detection of security risks and challenges caused by economic, social and environmental problems. Opinions differed on the possibility of establishing a formal system/mechanism of indicators for identifying crisis situations.

There was agreement that, in accordance with the concept of the Platform for Co-operative Security, the OSCE's economic and environmental dimension should provide political impetus for work carried out by specialized economic and financial bodies, and that the OSCE - as a Europe-wide security organization - is well placed to provide such an impulse in support of the reform efforts needed to permit the integration of transition economies into the world economy. However, differences of principle persist regarding the need for the OSCE to go beyond this role and to develop additional capabilities in this area.

The main topics being considered in discussions are: the overall role of the OSCE and institutional matters, early warning system, post-conflict rehabilitation, the role of OSCE missions/field operations, co-operation with international organizations and institutions and NGOs, as well as possibilities for establishing a special Foundation for the OSCE Economic Dimension.

Platform for Co-operative Security

The main assumption guiding the work was that comprehensive security in the OSCE area requires co-operation and co-ordination among participating States and relevant organizations and institutions of which they are also members. Participating States agreed on the need to strengthen the non-hierarchical, mutually reinforcing nature of the relationship between those organizations and institutions, utilizing comparative advantages, with a view to fostering a foundation for common, comprehensive and indivisible security in the OSCE area. To this end, they have chosen to co-operate on the basis of the Platform for Co-operative Security. Through the Platform, participating States will develop complementary and mutually reinforcing relations between international organizations and institutions engaged in strengthening comprehensive security in the OSCE area.

There was a common understanding that issues of comprehensive security cannot be regarded in terms of any single dimension. Co-operation between the OSCE and other organizations in the field of the human dimension and the economic dimension should be further promoted. Co-operation between the OSCE and other organizations is also an important dimension with regard to assisting participating States in their compliance with OSCE commitments. In line with Platform principles it was suggested that police activities should be based on close co-ordination and utilization of comparative advantages. With regard to new risks and challenges, the approach should be differentiated according to the nature and specificity of the risks. The potential of the OSCE through the Platform in co-operating with other international organizations to assist Central-Asian states should be further explored. At the same time, it was underlined that, while broadening the scope, it is important to avoid a dilution of the Platform concept by attempting to apply the same arrangements to all other organizations equally.

There was also agreement regarding the need for improved exchange of information, including regular contacts and liaison arrangements, with other international organizations and institutions, but the idea of establishing formal framework agreements between the OSCE and other international organizations as a basis for co-operation at all levels has not found support.

The OSCE as a forum for regional and subregional interaction

The understanding that regional/subregional co-operation aimed at serving local needs, solving local problems and building mutual confidence among States in individual regions constitutes a valuable contribution to the overall security of the OSCE community was at the basis of all discussions. Furthermore, it was commonly understood that the work on a Document-Charter offers an opportunity to utilize further the potential of the regional/subregional dimension as an integral part of the Organization's activity and thus to contribute to the indivisibility of security throughout the OSCE area.

Delegations are in agreement that the OSCE should support and encourage regional/subregional efforts by participating States, and contribute with information to all other OSCE member States about ongoing regional/subregional processes. For their part, participating States should seek to ensure that the aims, principles and norms of regional/subregional agreements, organizations, arrangements and initiatives in which they participate are consistent with OSCE principles and norms. Most delegations also seem to agree that the Document-Charter should contain an indicative list of possible areas for regional/subregional or bilateral co-operation.

Consensus has, however, not been found on a proposal to let the OSCE, at the request of the States participating in subregional processes, exercise the powers and functions of a guarantor for implementation of regional/subregional agreements and decisions. There is also a need for further discussions on a proposal to allow the Permanent Council regularly review progress achieved in regional/subregional processes, determine new areas and recommend forms of regional/subregional efforts. It has also been proposed to permit the OSCE to establish a Conference of Subregional Organizations and Associations in order to exchange experience and ensure the broadest possible examination of issues involved in maintaining stability and security in the OSCE area, but this suggestion also requires further study.

The OSCE role in connection with peacekeeping (in light of the overall OSCE role in conflict prevention)

A number of views regarding the OSCE's role in connection with peacekeeping have been identified. One view is that the OSCE should not play a military role in peacekeeping operations, since other international organizations or coalitions of States have the necessary capabilities for conducting such operations. The OSCE has proven capabilities in the fields of "conflict prevention" and "humanitarian assistance", which require no military resources but civilian personnel and tasks.

Another view is that the OSCE should adopt measures to enhance its capabilities for peacekeeping operations, including the performance of their own peacekeeping operations, participation in such operations conducted at the decision of the United Nations, and also the enlistment of other organizations and groups of States for OSCE peacekeeping operations.

The third approach around which a common understanding may be emerging is conceptually based on the Helsinki Document 1992, which divides the OSCE's involvement in peacekeeping into three categories: The OSCE could make contributions to multifunctional operations in areas where it has comparative advantages; the OSCE could request support from other organizations for conducting peacekeeping operations on its behalf; the OSCE itself could lead and conduct peacekeeping operation.

There seems to be broad agreement that the OSCE has a vital role to play in connection with multifunctional peacekeeping operations in areas where it has comparative advantages. Further, there is broad agreement that the possibility of the OSCE requesting other organizations to make their resources available should be kept open. There may be an emerging consensus on the advisability of keeping the options open with regard to OSCE-led military peacekeeping. There is no agreement on the proposal to earmark military units for OSCE peacekeeping contingents and to set up a single military command structure under the Permanent Council and the OSCE Secretariat.

Security and co-operation in adjacent areas

The point of departure for all discussions was the assumption that strengthening of security and co-operation in adjacent areas, in particular the Mediterranean, was an important factor for stability in the OSCE area and that closer co-operation with all partners for co-operation would be required in order to promote the norms and values shared by the OSCE participating States.

There seems to be general agreement about the aim of expanding co-operation with the partners. A number of concrete proposals have been put forward regarding both the content of and the modalities for such co-operation, i.e. the need to enhance the substantive content of the informal open-ended Contact Group's programme, strengthening of the institutional and procedural aspects of co-operation between the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (MPC) and the Conflict Prevention Centre, and invitations to attend meetings of the Permanent Council, the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Security Model Committee. These proposals will have to be discussed further.

Suggestions for co-operation with Japan and the Republic of Korea have also been made, relating for example to joint conduct of operations in Central Asia and the establishment of close contacts between the OSCE and the Asia Regional Forum. These ideas would also need further clarification and elaboration.

CHRONOLOGY OF WORK ON THE DOCUMENT-CHARTER IN 1998

The Polish Chairmanship started work on the Document-Charter at the beginning of 1998. On 15 January a programme for the initial phase of work on the Document-Charter was established. Understanding was also reached on the need to look for practical means of enhancing the effectiveness of the OSCE throughout its field of activity and work so as to intensify its co-operation with other international organizations and institutions while negotiations on the Document-Charter are in progress.

On 23 January the Security Model Committee was presented with the first work programme for the process which is to lead to the adoption of the Document-Charter.

The first outline of basic assumptions for the Document-Charter was distributed on 18 February. Unfortunately, owing to differences of opinion among delegations, it was not possible to reach a common understanding on these basic assumptions.

The reinforced meeting of the Permanent Council which took place on 27 March 1998 decided that three working bodies, i.e. the Security Model Committee and two Working Groups (A and B), should be assigned the task of working on the content of the Document-Charter. In addition to its negotiating tasks, the Security Model Committee was also tasked with supervising and reviewing the work of the Working Groups.

On 3 July an informal meeting of the Security Model Committee was convened with the participation of representatives of North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Western European Union, the European Union Commission, the Council of Europe and the Commonwealth Independent States in order to discuss issues relating to development of the "Platform for Co-operative Security", and in particular to the contribution which international organizations and institutions might make to the OSCE's work on this concept.

The reinforced meeting of the Permanent Council on 17 July reviewed the work on the Document-Charter. At this meeting the Chairmanship presented a report on enhancement of the OSCE's co-operation with other international organizations and institutions in accordance with Decision No. 5 of the Copenhagen Ministerial Council Meeting.

On the basis of the progress achieved in the first half of the year, the Security Model Committee decided to increase the frequency of meetings of the Working Groups.

On 1 October the Security Model Committee initiated its work on the manner in which the progress achieved so far should be reflected. Discussions concentrated on three possible variants:

1. A non-negotiable progress report to be presented by the Chairman-in-Office;
2. A progress report together with documents containing guidelines for further work on certain separate items under discussion and highlighting the areas requiring special attention;

3. An annotated framework, i.e. a progress report accompanied by an annotated agenda for further work, consisting of:
- Documents containing guidelines for further work;
 - A Chairman's perception on the question of structure;
 - Recommendations for a further work programme.

On 29 October a second informal meeting of the Security Model Committee devoted to discussion of issues relating to the "Platform for Co-operative Security" concept was held with the participation of Geneva- and Vienna-based United Nations agencies, and in particular International Atomic Energy Agency, OCHA, ODCCP, United Nations Development Programme, UNESCO, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

The last reinforced meeting of the Permanent Council in 1998 took place on 12 November and was attended by the Chairman-in-Office. There was a common understanding that in Oslo the OSCE should try to confirm its continued political commitment to work on the Document-Charter on European Security and to record, wherever possible, the negotiating progress made on various issues, and that the drafting process should start and should result in a Document-Charter that would reflect the aspirations of all OSCE States, create a common vision for the twenty-first century and thus be worthy of adoption at the OSCE Summit.

BASIC FRAMEWORK OF THE CHARTER ON EUROPEAN SECURITY

NEW RISKS AND CHALLENGES TO SECURITY

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. A common and indivisible security space in the OSCE area is a joint responsibility of the OSCE participating States. They have committed themselves to addressing the security concerns of all member States in solidarity.
2. The end of the bloc to bloc confrontation has established human rights and democracy as the common values of all our countries. At the same time, however, the new openness and freedom have created an environment conducive to the emergence of new risks and challenges to security.
3. The Lisbon Summit Declaration on a common and comprehensive security model for Europe for the twenty-first century, has tasked the participating States with “refining the existing tools and developing additional ones in order to encourage participating States to make greater use of the OSCE in advancing their security.”
4. The Ministerial Meeting in Copenhagen decided that the Document-Charter “should serve the needs of our peoples in the new century by addressing risks and challenges to security, thus contributing to a common security space within the OSCE area” and called on participating States to “examine an appropriate role for the OSCE, including ways in which the OSCE can facilitate international efforts, in addressing new risks and challenges to security”.
5. The OSCE has already done some work in this field, notably through the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC). The FSC has developed principles governing conventional arms transfers and non-proliferation. The Code of Conduct adopted by the FSC in 1994 deals with some aspects of terrorism.
6. The appointment in 1998 of a Co-ordinator for OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities will assist our understanding of these aspects of security.

II. PRINCIPLES

1. The OSCE participating States have committed themselves to act in solidarity to promote full implementation of the principles and commitments of the OSCE enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris and other OSCE documents. We need to work together to deal with new risks and challenges.
2. The Document-Charter will offer a framework and general principles for identifying new risks and challenges, for affirming existing commitments, for encouraging development of new processes, and for interrelating these new processes with the processes already going on in other organizations.
3. In doing so, the participating States will examine an appropriate role for the OSCE, including ways in which the OSCE can facilitate international efforts in addressing new risks and challenges to security.

4. The participating States will continue to be guided by the comprehensive concept of security of the OSCE, the indivisibility of security, the principle that no OSCE participating State should seek to enhance its own security at the expense of another, and the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

III. IDENTIFICATION OF NEW RISKS AND CHALLENGES

1. The Lisbon Summit Declaration, the Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model and the Copenhagen Ministerial Decision regarding guidelines on a Document-Charter provide identification of a number of new risks and challenges.

2. The Lisbon Summit Declaration (Articles 7,9,12) refers to: illegal arms supplies, violations of human rights, such as involuntary migration, and the lack of full democratization, threats to independent media, electoral fraud, manifestations of aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism.

3. The Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model (Article 2) notes that human rights are not fully respected in all OSCE States. Ethnic tension, aggressive nationalism, violations of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, as well as serious difficulties of economic transition, can threaten stability and may also spread to other States. Terrorism, organized crime, drugs and arms trafficking, uncontrolled migration and environmental damage are of increasing concern to the entire OSCE community.

4. The Copenhagen Ministerial Decision (No. 5, pt. (g)) refers to violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms and manifestations of intolerance, aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism.

IV. THE EVOLVING NATURE OF NEW RISKS AND CHALLENGES

Issues that need to be addressed

1. The evolving nature of new risks and challenges in a changing security environment probably means that an all-inclusive definition is neither possible nor desirable. The future may yet hold additional new risks and challenges.

2. It has been suggested to add the following issues to the above-mentioned, agreed areas of new risks and challenges:

Within the politico-military dimension:

- Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their delivery means
- Breakdown of public order
- Human trafficking
- Smuggling of components and materials of WMD

Within the human dimension:

- Prevention of family reunification
- Gender discrimination
- Non-respect of rights of migrant workers

Within the economic dimension:

- Disruption of the flow of energy and natural resources
- Economic disparities
- Impediments to free trade
- Non-compliance with agreements in the economic field

V. NEW RISKS AND CHALLENGES TO SECURITY AND A POSSIBLE ROLE FOR THE OSCE

Issues for further discussions

Other international organizations are already engaged in many of the areas described above. The point has been made that unnecessary duplication should be avoided. The question is therefore what added value the OSCE could give to the efforts already undertaken by other international organizations.

The suggestion has been made that this question could be answered in the following way:

- One of the principal roles of the OSCE is its function as a tool of early warning in emerging security risks and challenges. The OSCE's missions and various institutions are important elements of the Organization in performing its early warning tasks.

Therefore, missions must be able to follow the emergence and manifestations of new risks and challenges in a more conscious manner, reporting on destabilizing developments which come to their attention. This could be done by including in the mandate of missions, where necessary, relevant provisions, as well as providing mission personnel with information and training which would enable them to observe developments with a more trained eye. In case the inclusion of civilian police components in OSCE field missions is adopted, these civilian police components should be trained in identifying the emergence of new risks and challenges and their repercussions for regional stability, reporting on these issues.

- A round table may be organized, parallel to the work on the Document-Charter, to discuss new risks and challenges and to help provide input for what the OSCE can further do in this area in the context of the Document-Charter.
- A focal point may also be established in the Secretariat to map out OSCE strategy in addressing new risks and challenges. This may be done before the adoption of the

Document-Charter in order to provide input to the work on the Document-Charter. The Document-Charter may then in turn elaborate on the tasks of the focal point.

- In addition to an enhanced early warning function of the OSCE in the field of new risks and challenges as outlined above, the participating States through the Document-Charter may commit themselves to start work on a "Code of Conduct" to address new risks and challenges, co-ordinating of national policies on the issue and developing their co-operation with one another in this field.
- Seen in this framework, the OSCE participating States are entitled to receive information on what measures are being taken by other participating States to adhere to their commitments relating to issues which fall under "New Risks and Challenges". This may be exemplified in the Document-Charter. In this context, any participating State may at any time request clarification from another participating State, directly or within the framework of regular Permanent Council meetings, in connection with that State's implementation of OSCE commitments. The clarification may also be requested within the framework of FSC meetings on issues relating to its mandate (e.g. Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security). The participating States requested, will undertake to provide a clarification within a fixed period of time. Any bilateral or multilateral consultations may involve the Chairman-in-Office or his representative, as appropriate. A participating State suffering from the consequences of non-compliance by another participating State, following the application of the provisions mentioned above, will undertake to inform all other participating States in the Permanent Council (and/or FSC).
- The OSCE institutions, upon request, may also be tasked, within their respective competence, with providing objective assessments on compliance with OSCE commitments by participating States.
- The OSCE, through supportive public statements, can perform an important political role in addressing new risks and challenges. This role could be further elaborated in the Charter.
- Solidarity is not just a question of participating States working together bilaterally or through the OSCE. Co-operation between organizations or co-operation with a participating State through other organizations are also important elements. Therefore, there is a need to have a person or personnel in the OSCE Secretariat with relevant experience and qualifications to prepare for co-operation and contact with other institutions and organizations in jointly addressing new risks and challenges. This task could also be performed by the focal point at the Secretariat.

Practical preparatory work cannot be postponed until the Document-Charter has been adopted. In order to define more clearly how the OSCE can facilitate international efforts in addressing new risks and challenges, a meeting between representatives of organizations and institutions dealing with new risks and challenges should be organized in the first half of 1999. The Security Model Committee could draw on both civilian and military expertise from international organizations with experience in this field to address the political and operational aspects of how the OSCE can contribute to ongoing work on new risks and challenges in international forums, with a view to avoiding duplication but ensuring that any OSCE-specific added value would be maximized.

The above suggestions need to be discussed further.

POLITICO-MILITARY ASPECTS OF SECURITY

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Politico-military aspects, including arms control, are integral to the OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative concept of security. The strong commitment of the OSCE participating States to full implementation and further development of arms control agreements and confidence- and security-building measures is essential for enhancing political and military stability and security within the OSCE area. Through the Document-Charter the positive trends of co-operation, transparency and predictability will be strengthened.

2. The participating States have undertaken a variety of obligations and commitments in the field of politico-military aspects of security, including arms control. Such obligations and commitments are legally or politically binding and vary in their substance and geographical scope, being global, OSCE-wide, regional or bilateral. Full implementation of these obligations and commitments is essential for building the collective and individual security of the participating States, irrespective of whether or not they are parties or signatories to such agreements.

3. The work on this chapter of the Document-Charter will have to be seen in connection with other ongoing processes in the politico-military sphere.

II. PRINCIPLES

The following principles will guide the further work of participating States in the field of politico-military aspects of security:

- indivisibility of security;
- maintenance and enhancement of security of all participating States, regardless of whether or not they belong to politico-military alliances;
- maintenance and enhancement of transparency and predictability;
- ensuring democratic political control of military forces;
- no participating State, organization or grouping will strengthen its security at the expense of the security of others;
- no participating State, organization or grouping can have any superior responsibility for maintaining peace and stability in the OSCE area, or regard any part of the OSCE area as its sphere of influence;
- all participating States will ensure full implementation of arms control agreements at all times;

- participating States will ensure that arms control agreements continue to respond to security needs in the OSCE area;
- complementarity between OSCE-wide and regional approaches;
- each participating State will maintain only such military capabilities as are commensurate with legitimate individual or collective security needs, taking into account its obligations under international law;
- all participating States have the right to choose or change their security arrangements, including treaties of alliance.

III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCUMENT-CHARTER IN THE FIELD OF POLITICO-MILITARY ASPECTS

1. When considering any possible new measures to enhance transparency, predictability and co-operation, participating States will base themselves on the continued significance of already existing agreements. The CFE Treaty establishes a core of military stability and predictability, which is fundamental to the security of all participating States of the OSCE. The Vienna Document has brought about increased transparency and mutual confidence as regards military forces and military activities of all OSCE participating States.
2. The Code of Conduct has defined important norms for politico-military aspects of security.
3. On a regional level, Articles II, IV and V under the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina constitute an important part of the OSCE's efforts to strengthen security and stability.
4. In addition, the Treaty on Open Skies, once it has entered into force, can make a major contribution to transparency and openness.
5. Building on the results achieved and in order to strengthen the security of all participating States, future work on arms control, confidence- and security-building measures as well as other politico-military related aspects will address emerging and new challenges and will further develop transparency, openness and co-operation in the politico-military field.
6. In this connection, the following suggestions have been made:
 - Ways and means to contribute to a strengthening of the non-proliferation regime so as to counter the threat of spreading weapons of mass destruction will be considered. OSCE participating States, irrespective of whether they belong to politico-military alliances and arrangements, shall refrain from placing nuclear weapons on territories where they do not exist at present.
 - OSCE participating States shall take measures to implement the idea of the creation of nuclear- weapon-free zones in the OSCE region, in conformity with internationally recognized principles for the creation of such zones and as a necessary and important component of the new security architecture.

- Special attention must be paid to respect for the security interests of countries not belonging to military alliances and groupings. Their security shall be guaranteed by a whole set of pan-European, subregional and national measures, including the implementation of arms control measures, on the basis of the principle of indivisibility of security and universality of participation in the guaranteeing of such security.
- The Document-Charter should, based on the principles referred to in Section II, help to promote co-operative responses to challenges and risks that may be dealt with through politico-military measures. In further elaborating such measures, the OSCE Forum for Security Co-operation and, as appropriate, the Permanent Council, as forums for dialogue and co-operation, should be involved.

The above suggestions will have to be discussed further.

EARLY WARNING, CONFLICT PREVENTION, CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION, INCLUDING THE OSCE ROLE WITH REGARD TO POLICE OPERATIONS

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation are priority orientations in enhancing security and stability in the OSCE area. The OSCE role in this field is well defined in OSCE documents and, in particular, in the Helsinki Document 1992.
2. The OSCE has already established an internationally recognized niche for itself as an organization specializing in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. What yet has to be done is to confirm that the OSCE is able to act effectively and be a respected partner in this realm. The OSCE will remain an attractive partner for co-operation as long as it is in a position to offer a specific contribution to early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, and does not pretend to be the only source of wisdom. That is why particular attention should be devoted to the question of promoting synergies in this area. Due consideration should be given, in co-operation with OSCE partner organizations, to how best to create an efficient, comprehensive and internally complementary system based on the comparative advantages of different organizations.
3. The procedures and mechanisms at the disposal of the OSCE are efficient and useful. There is a need, however, to ensure their full synergy, to create one homogeneous system, to process efficiently information received from all the different sources, and to make a link between deliberations of political organs and operative actions of the OSCE in Vienna and in the field. This would contribute to increasing awareness of developments endangering peace and stability in the OSCE area.
4. Recent experience has shown that present crisis-management and post-conflict-rehabilitation operations increasingly involve police activities as part of the international community's overall effort. As OSCE's experience in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Albania has demonstrated, successfully implementing mandates to promote

human rights extends beyond interaction with strictly civil authorities to include monitoring of police operations. That is, certain elements of police operations are already an integral part of an OSCE mission's broader mandate to address rule-of-law issues. In areas of conflict or where conflict threatens, control over the police by individual political leaders or parties frequently make the police an obstacle to the building of democracy. Furthermore, in such situations the police are often one of the main perpetrators of human rights violations. International police operations therefore provide an important contribution to building and consolidating democracy, and enhancing respect for human rights. Such operations contribute to the "uniqueness" of the Organization.

5. The OSCE should draw on the experience gained by other organizations in the field. The United Nations has the widest experience in civilian police activities. However, other relevant international organizations can play a role in such activities. Several organizations have been or are engaged in various forms of international police operations. There is a need to make the best possible use of the comparative advantages of the relevant organizations. Discussions of OSCE police activities have therefore to be seen also in the wider context of the Platform for Co-operative Security. Which organization is best suited to carry out a specific task in a specific country has to be decided on a case-by-case basis according to the actual circumstances.

6. Broad membership, flexibility to respond quickly to changing circumstances, and a critical role in European conflict prevention and resolution efforts make it a logical choice for the OSCE to develop a capability in the field of police activities. The OSCE police operations, together with existing activities, could represent a continuum of efforts, where each would be linked to and reinforce the others. Without such operations, the effect of other tasks carried out by the OSCE could be weakened in comparison to what it would be if those tasks were supplemented by police training or monitoring. Such operations could also contribute to the integration of the country involved (together with its police service) into the Euro-Atlantic community of shared values. Finally, in some cases where police operations are desirable, other organizations might not be willing to get involved because of the character of the situation, their priorities or their membership.

7. Recent developments in the OSCE area call for the early establishment of the OSCE concept for police operations. This is why there is a need to elaborate basic guidelines in this regard even before the Document-Charter on European Security which will reflect the final shape of the concept, is adopted.

8. As a regional arrangement within the terms of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, the OSCE is an organization of first resort for the peaceful settlement of disputes within its area. That is why it is of particular importance to continue efforts to further enhance the OSCE's efficiency as a primary instrument for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

II. PRINCIPLES

1. The participating States proceed from respect for the main responsibility of the United Nations as laid down in its Charter for maintaining peace and security, as well as the principles of international law and justice. OSCE activities relating to early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation should be implemented in full conformity with the United Nations Charter.

2. Activities involving early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation should be based on full respect for OSCE norms, principles and commitments, including those contained in the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between participating States set forth in the Helsinki Final Act. The activities in this respect should be impartial and balanced in character.

3. The participating States are committed to continuously developing the OSCE's comprehensive approach to security. Action in this respect should be aimed primarily at conflict prevention, and the OSCE's goal should be to deal with the "grass roots" of conflicts at the earliest possible stage in their development.

4. The participating States are committed to increasing the OSCE's role with regard to police operations. To this end, close co-operation with the international organizations having relevant experience in conducting police operations, especially the United Nations, should be established.

5. Whenever deciding on new OSCE missions, or extending the mandate of an existing mission, the question could be asked whether the inclusion of a police element in the Mission's work would be appropriate.

6. The OSCE should be ready, when requested by a participating State, to provide appropriate assistance with regard to issues relating to police activities. Such assistance should consist, *inter alia*, of the provision of various forms of police training, advice on police reform/restructuring, and police monitoring.

7. The participating States agree on the need for the OSCE to continue evolving into an organization that is more operational and that will also remain flexible and effective.

8. The participating States reaffirm their commitment, adopted by the Rome Ministerial Council Meeting, concerning the legal capacity of the OSCE institutions and regarding privileges and immunities (CSCE/4-C/Dec.2), and in particular the privileges and immunities of members of OSCE missions and representatives.

III. EARLY WARNING, CONFLICT PREVENTION, CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION

Issues that need to be addressed

1. Early warning system

The need to improve the early warning system concerns all OSCE bodies and missions/field presences. The OSCE Secretariat, in accordance with its mandate, possibly on the basis of the activities of the Conflict Prevention Centre as well as the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, could consolidate its practice of submitting to the Chairman-in-Office's period (e.g., quarterly) report on possible challenges in the OSCE area. The same kind of reports could also be prepared by the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM), ODIHR and Representative on Freedom of the Media.

2. Systematization of available instruments, mechanisms and procedures

In the course of discussions on this subject the view was expressed that there was a need to establish an indicative list of possible instruments, mechanisms and procedures for

“operative OSCE activities”, ranging from personal and special representatives of the Chairman-in-Office to OSCE presences in the field.

3. Systematization of aims of instruments, mechanisms and procedures

There is shared opinion about the need to establish a list of possible tasks and purposes of mechanisms and procedures for “operative OSCE activities”, ranging from fact-finding to contributing to the settlement of disputes and the restoration of law and order.

4. Systematization of mandates

There is a proposal to establish general rules concerning mandates of mechanisms and procedures for “operative OSCE activities” - preparation, initiation, discontinuation, adoption, precise nature.

5. Appointment of the heads of “operative OSCE activities”

The view was expressed that there is a need to establish procedure for consultations on the appointment of heads of “operative OSCE activities”.

6. Normalization of management

There is a suggestion to establish a procedure to be followed by the Chairman-in-Office on important issues relating to the functioning of mechanisms and procedures for “operative OSCE activities”.

7. Reporting

A proposal was made to establish formal rules relating to submission by heads of “operative OSCE activities” of their written and/or oral reports, as well as concerning the examination by participating States of the recommendations contained in these reports, including States directly affected by the content of these reports.

8. Recruitment of staff

The view was expressed about the need to change the present system of recruitment, both in relation to the body responsible for the selection of candidates (CPC) and regarding the basic principles of recruitment (geographical balance and budgetary proportionality).

It is also suggested to confirm the application of the principle of secondment to “operative OSCE activities” and to establish rules regarding the duration of such secondment (one year with possible extension for one more year).

9. Training

The need to improve training of personnel involved in activities relating to early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation was noted. It is suggested that such training could be organized in co-operation between the Troika and the OSCE institution in question.

The opinion was also expressed that a system to which partner organizations of the OSCE might contribute, especially in relation to their main field of specialization, could be established.

10. Co-operation with humanitarian organizations

It was restated that while co-operating with humanitarian organizations the OSCE should take into consideration the distinctive character of those organizations. The need to establish principles of such interaction was also underlined (humane attitude, impartiality, non-discrimination).

IV. POLICE OPERATIONS

Types of police operations the OSCE might conduct

Police operations in general can include a broad spectrum of activities. At present, the most likely areas of operation are:

- passive and active monitoring of local police to ensure, *inter alia*, that human rights and fundamental freedoms are protected;
- different forms of training (in the field and in the classroom), including conduct of "Training of Trainers" programs; and
- advising local police, as part of OSCE activities in conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, *inter alia* on issues related to strengthening law and order and maintaining safe and stable situation.

The door should not be closed to more complex and demanding missions. It cannot be excluded that the OSCE could be called upon to take on tasks like those carried out by unarmed police. This would probably presuppose a partnership with a military mission (such as SFOR). In future missions the OSCE could also link the civilian police activities of international organizations to OSCE crisis management operations.

In this regard, the OSCE could also determine the particular suitability of certain national police elements for use in any possible OSCE co-ordinated operation with more robust monitoring requirements.

Today, it seems highly unlikely to envisage armed OSCE police units carrying out executive policing. However, due regard should be paid to the consideration of the idea of the OSCE police operations' contribution to restoring public order, ensuring legality and promoting national reconciliation.

Main considerations that should be addressed in further work

1. Building on, *inter alia*, the Helsinki Document 1992 and the Code of Conduct, the Document-Charter should provide guidelines for future OSCE police activities.
2. It should be explicitly stated in the Document-Charter that OSCE police activities are an integral part of its tasks in the field of conflict prevention, crisis management and post conflict rehabilitation.

3. The OSCE should address police activities in the Document-Charter as a multidisciplinary task concerning various organizations. The need for close co-ordination according to the Platform for Co-operative Security principles and the Common Concept should therefore be a guiding principle. It should be clearly stated that there is a need to make use of the comparative advantages of the various organizations and to avoid duplication of work.
4. The relationship between the police missions and police reform with reform in other areas, such as the judiciary and prison system, as well as changes in the legal framework in which police services operate, should also be addressed in the Document-Charter. In this context, the need to establish close contacts with other international organizations should also be reflected.
5. The OSCE should state in the Document-Charter its willingness in principle to contribute both to the monitoring of and to the provision of training and advice to local police forces as part of its crisis management activities.
6. Consideration could also be given to the possibility of the OSCE offering, where appropriate, to serve as a flexible framework for co-operation of crisis management efforts, including police activities.
7. The inclusion of civilian police components in OSCE field missions makes it necessary to strengthen, at least on a temporary basis, the operational capacity of the Organization. A person or personnel with relevant experience and qualifications should be identified and made responsible for preparing for OSCE police operations. This should be accompanied by the endowment of the Secretariat and, more specifically, the CPC with the means to ensure adequate support for OSCE police activities.

Furthermore, the participating States should provide names, qualifications, etc. of persons able to perform such tasks as planning and implementation of various kinds of police operations.

8. Standard operational procedures as well as a profile for mission members tasked with police monitoring functions could be drawn up, which could be used as the basis for discussing and agreeing on mandates for police missions of various kinds. The appointed person/personnel tasked with preparing for OSCE police operations should take an active part in this process. The OSCE could work with the United Nations Department for Peacekeeping Operations to draw on those standards already developed by the United Nations for use in Croatia and in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

9. A mandate by the OSCE itself might suffice for the OSCE police activities, although a United Nations mandate might be required in some cases.

A mandate for executive policing may be conferred only by a decision of the United Nations Security Council.

10. The Head of mission/field presence should be responsible for the an ground management of activities involving civil police.

11. The need for strict compliance by the OSCE police missions with the norms and principles of the OSCE and with international law, including international humanitarian law,

and in particular with provisions of the United Nations Charter and relevant decisions of the United Nations Security Council, should be stressed.

12. It might prove useful to differentiate between OSCE missions entirely dedicated to police activities and the - probably more likely - case of police monitoring elements in OSCE missions as an integral part of their overall mandate.

13. The possibility of the OSCE drawing upon the resources of other organizations might be considered.

14. Appropriate staffing of missions should be ensured. To this end, the OSCE should develop, in consultation with the United Nations DPKO CIVPOL Unit, an international roster of suitable persons for police operations, particularly monitoring and training.

15. OSCE participating States might wish to organize courses aimed at standardizing programmes for police training. Such programmes could include such subjects as: human dignity in policing; policing in a democratic society; modern policing skills; specialized skills in relation to combating corruption, organized crime, terrorism, drug trafficking, etc. Such courses could be organized in a framework of an OSCE Police Academy (at a fixed location or in a mobile training team format) or they could consist of a set of OSCE police standards which could be implemented through co-operative activities with existing police monitoring/training programs and institutes (in Hungary, Italy, Poland, Sweden; Switzerland and elsewhere).

16. OSCE participating States should declare their readiness to provide the human, technical and financial resources necessary for the conduct of OSCE-mandated police operations.

Questions to be answered

- (a) Should the chain of command in the case of police operations be different from the one applicable with regard to OSCE missions, i.e., should the Chairman-in-Office be replaced by Permanent Council (political guidance) and the Secretariat by a single military command structure (administration and operations)?
- (b) Should the mandate define a deadline for concluding the OSCE police operation or should this depart solely on the fulfilment of operation's objectives?

A list of other issues related to this topic that should be discussed

- OSCE mission experience to date with police monitoring and United Nations lessons learned;
- Examination of police monitoring/training conducted in the OSCE area; possible lessons learned;
- Mission mandate/specific operational authorities for OSCE police monitoring;
- Mission organization, structure, staffing and reporting channels;
- Personal safety of OSCE police monitors;

- Where and how police monitoring may contribute to personal safety and access for international organizations and NGOs participating in humanitarian relief activities;
- Qualifications and selection of personnel;
- Whether and how police monitoring may support civil human rights monitoring;
- Possible standards by which to measure police/paramilitary force conduct;
- Comparison of advantages/disadvantages of armed as opposed to unarmed police;
- Comparison of advantages/disadvantages of uniformed as opposed to non-uniformed police monitors;
- Role that the OSCE might play in follow-on training to improve police/paramilitary conduct;
- Concrete support for local police reform efforts;
- Interaction between judicial authorities and police/paramilitary leadership;
- How corrections/penal policy is implemented and its consistency with international standards and Helsinki principles;
- The nature of the police/prison system relationship and how judiciary/prosecution authorities interact with the police;
- The role criminal investigative authorities play in police enforcement and its effect on observance of human rights.

ASSISTANCE IN ADHERENCE TO/IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLES, NORMS AND COMMITMENTS

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. The participating States proceed from the fact that compliance with OSCE principles, norms and commitments contributes to the creation of a common and indivisible security space and increases the security of all OSCE participating States. Respect for commitments, including the willingness of each participating State to enhance its compliance and to remain open to OSCE institutions in this regard, is an essential aspect of co-operative security.
2. Acts of non-compliance with OSCE principles and commitments degrade the common security space to the detriment of all OSCE participating States.
3. As a regional arrangement within the terms of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, the OSCE is an organization of first resort for the peaceful settlement of disputes within its area.

II. PRINCIPLES

1. The participating States recognize that they are accountable to their citizens and responsible to one another for respect of OSCE norms and principles and for the implementation of their commitments. They recognize that the OSCE commitments are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not refer exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned, since respect for these commitments constitutes one of the foundations of the international order.
2. The participating States have committed themselves to act in solidarity in order to promote full implementation of previously agreed on principles and commitments enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, in the Charter of Paris as well as in other OSCE documents such as the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security. They also have an obligation to act in solidarity in order to prevent violations of OSCE norms and principles on the illegal threat or use of force and to protect democratic institutions and human rights.
3. The participating States encourage co-operation between organizations, within the framework of the Common Concept for the Development of Co-operation between Mutually-Reinforcing Institutions, and/or co-operation with participating States through other organizations, in order to enhance compliance with OSCE principles, norms and commitments.
4. The participating States acknowledge that compliance is ultimately the responsibility of each individual State.
5. The participating States are fully committed to entering into a dialogue in cases of difficulties in implementing OSCE commitments and, in that spirit of co-operation, they will also provide assistance to any participating State facing such difficulties.
6. In accordance with international law, including the United Nations Charter, the participating States will provide support to those States whose security is threatened by the non-implementation by another participating State of its commitments and they will refrain from supporting States that seriously contravene OSCE principles, norms and commitments.
7. The participating States will at all times co-operate with other participating States and with the OSCE, including its institutions, to receive their representatives on their territory, as well as to guarantee or facilitate their free access to persons and institutions, in accordance with the laws of the receiving State.
8. Any action undertaken by the OSCE and/or its participating States will be without prejudice to principle VI of the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States set out in the Helsinki Final Act.

III. ACTION IN CASE OF IDENTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH A VIEW TO ACTION BY THE OSCE

1. The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and any other relevant OSCE institution will monitor, in accordance with their respective mandates, the implementation of OSCE commitments in their respective fields of activity, and may report to the Chairman-in-Office any shortcomings in the implementation of these commitments that they may have identified, thereby fulfilling their early warning function.

2. Any participating State may at any time request clarification from another participating State, directly or within the framework of regular Permanent Council meetings, in connection with that State's implementation of OSCE commitments. Clarification on issues relating to the mandate of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) may also be requested in the framework of FSC meetings. The participating State requested will provide, within the same framework, a clarification within a specified period of time (to be agreed upon in general or on a case-by-case basis). Any bilateral or multilateral consultations may involve the Chairman-in-Office or his representative, as appropriate.

3. A participating State facing difficulties in implementing OSCE principles and commitments, following the application of the provisions mentioned above will undertake to inform all other participating States in the Permanent Council of the nature and extent of the difficulties it is facing. The participating State in question may request the convening of an emergency meeting of the Permanent Council or the Senior Council or a meeting of the reinforced Permanent Council, as appropriate.

4. The Chairman-in-Office may alert other relevant international organizations to the difficulties facing a given State.

IV. ASSISTANCE IN ENHANCING COMPLIANCE

1. The participating States are committed to exploring, both individually and through the international organizations to which they belong, the assistance they can provide to another participating State to help that State meet its commitments. Such assistance may include any advice or activity aimed at improving the implementation record of the State concerned. Such assistance may also be provided, as appropriate, by the Chairman-in-Office, the Troika, the High Commissioner on National Minorities, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, the Representative on Freedom of the Media, the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities or any other OSCE institution acting in accordance with its respective mandate.

2. The participating States encourage the use of the full range of OSCE instruments in finding ways of enhancing compliance. Apart from an assessment as to the relevance of instruments already existing or the possibility that the OSCE may, where necessary, have recourse to new tools, these instruments include, but are not limited to:

- Encouragement of dialogue;
- Submission of the matter to the Permanent Council; and/or, if appropriate, to the Forum for Security Co-operation;
- Consideration of the matter by Review Conferences and/or Human Dimension Implementation Meetings;
- Dispatch of personal representatives of the Chairman-in-Office, fact-finding missions or rapporteurs;
- Convening of roundtable meetings bringing together representatives of the OSCE, interested Governments and parties concerned;
- Assistance by the OSCE, its institutions and structures, in particular, by providing assistance that may include the organization of seminars or training programmes, the

raising of funds, the taking of measures of a legal, economic, financial or military nature, or any other activity aimed at improving the implementation record of the State concerned;

- Conciliation and arbitration, where applicable and upon decision of the States involved, involving the submission of the matter to the OSCE Court of Conciliation and Arbitration;
- Consideration of the situation and, where appropriate, submission of recommendations by the OSCE institutions in accordance with their respective mandates;
- Establishment of an OSCE mission of long duration;
- Convening of a special meeting of the reinforced Permanent Council or Senior Council.

V. MEASURES IN CASES WHERE EFFORTS TO ENHANCE IMPLEMENTATION ARE UNSUCCESSFUL

1. Participating States may at any time initiate a general discussion if they believe that a participating State has failed to demonstrate a co-operative approach to the enhancement of implementation of OSCE commitments.

2. There may be cases in which despite all efforts of participating States, a participating State proves itself persistently unwilling to implement commitments or to seek or receive assistance. Actions and measures taken in such cases should not exclude dialogue and should be taken with a view to restoring partnership. Very much as a last resort and by way of exception, the participating States may examine the possibility of the temporary suspension of a participating State from part of the work of the OSCE (decision making). Any decision to this effect would be subject to reconfirmation at the end of a specified period (or could of course be revoked by consensus at any time).

In cases of clear, gross and uncorrected violation of OSCE principles and its commitments and continued absence of co-operation by a participating State, the Chairman-in-Office, at the request of a participating State, may convene a special meeting of the Permanent Council, where necessary with the participation of high-level representatives, or a Senior Council meeting in order to discuss the case and suggest action to remedy the situation. The exceptional circumstances when all the above-mentioned measures have been exhausted and when all offers of assistance have failed to secure implementation, the agenda of the meeting, and any decisions it may take may be adopted without the consent of the State concerned. The meeting may also decide to convene a meeting at ministerial level.

In such cases, the participating States may decide to make their co-operation with this State subject to certain conditions and, where necessary, take corrective measures. These measures may include, but are not limited to, the following actions:

- recommendation to participating States to suspend political, economic and other kinds of co-operation;
- decision to refer the matter to the United Nations Security Council, with possible recommendation for the imposition of sanctions;

- denial of the right to speak in the deliberations of the Permanent Council or its subsidiary organs;
- denial of the right to participate in the decision-making of proceedings of the Permanent Council.

Question to be answered

Who will determine the existence of “clear, gross and uncorrected” violations of the OSCE norms, principles and decisions, and how will this be done?

3. In all cases a participating State remains bound by the commitments it has undertaken within the framework of the OSCE.

JOINTLY CONSIDERED ACTIONS

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. The security of each participating State is inseparably linked to that of the others.
2. In the event of the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any OSCE participating State or in the event an internal breakdown of law and order on the territory of any participating State, timely and immediate reaction by participating States is required.

II. PRINCIPLES

1. The participating States, guided in particular by the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris and reaffirming the principle of the indivisibility of security, are committed to act promptly and in solidarity in the event of the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any OSCE participating State. They will render assistance to participating States in the event of an internal breakdown of law and order. The participating States are also committed to explore possibilities of co-ordinating their actions in this regard with other organizations concerned with security in the OSCE area.
2. By taking measures that it deems appropriate, with due respect for the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with the principle of solidarity, every participating State will assist any other participating State or States subjected to the threat or use of force against its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence. Assistance will also be provided to participating State or States facing an internal breakdown of law and order. All participating States will be informed about such measures of assistance.

Any common action by OSCE will not limit the rights of OSCE participating States to provide - individually or jointly - other assistance to a State subjected to the threat or use of force or facing an internal breakdown of law and order.

3. Any action undertaken by the OSCE and/or its participating States will be without prejudice to the overriding responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for maintaining peace and international security.

III. ASSISTANCE IN THE EVENT OF AN INTERNAL BREAKDOWN OF LAW AND ORDER

In accordance with principle VI of the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States set out in the Helsinki Final Act.

1. The Chairman-in-Office will initiate without delay consultations with the OSCE participating States and especially with the State seeking assistance, as well as discussions in various bodies of the OSCE. The participating States will consider jointly the nature of the situation as well as possible ways and means of providing support to the affected State.
2. The OSCE will offer its mediation in the search for a peaceful solution.
3. The participating States will devise co-ordinated responses, in particular within the terms of Chapter III of the Helsinki Document 1992, including responses as regards peacekeeping activities.

IV. ACTION IN THE EVENT OF THE THREAT OR USE OF FORCE

Taking fully into account the principal role of the United Nations Security Council in maintaining peace and international security:

1. The Chairman-in-Office will initiate without delay consultations with the OSCE participating States and especially with the State subjected to threat or use of force against its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence, as well as discussions in various bodies of the OSCE. The participating States will jointly consider the nature of the situation as well as possible ways and means of providing support to the State subjected to the threat or use of force.
2. The OSCE will offer its mediation in the search for peaceful solution.
3. The participating States will devise co-ordinated responses, in particular within the terms of Chapter III of the Helsinki Document 1992, including responses as regards peacekeeping activities.
4. The participating States will withhold assistance or support to States that fail to meet their obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of a State or in any other manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter and with the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between participating States set out in the Helsinki Final Act.
5. The participating States will act jointly to ensure that the State threatening or using force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any OSCE participating State is held accountable to the OSCE and/or the international community.
6. The participating States will consider cases of the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any OSCE participating State in the competent political, security and defence organizations of which they are members, with a view to giving concrete expression to the implementation of the principle of solidarity. This commitment do not affect the rights and obligations of the participating States arising from, *inter alia*, the international agreements and treaties to which they are parties to.

7. The participating States may decide to refer jointly a dispute to the United Nations Security Council on behalf of the OSCE whenever in their opinion action by the Security Council may be required, in particular within the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Such a decision may be taken, where necessary, in the absence of the consent of the States or State party to the dispute.

8. The participating States will provide collective support, in addition to the required individual support, for such measures as may be adopted by the United Nations Security Council.

9. The participating States will take any necessary action, jointly and promptly, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and in co-operation with other relevant security organizations of which they are members, in the event that any participating State threatens to use or uses force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any participating State, especially where such action is directed against any participating State unable to provide for its own defence. Such action will be without prejudice to the overriding responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for maintaining peace and international security.

HUMAN DIMENSION

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. The human dimension norms and commitments contained in the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE documents have proved instrumental in the profound changes that have taken place within the OSCE area in the last decade.

2. The human dimension is at the core of the OSCE's comprehensive concept of security. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are recognized as being of direct concern to all participating States.

3. The OSCE's comprehensive approach to security requires improvement in the implementation of all human dimension commitments. This will further anchor the common values of a free and democratic society in all participating States, which is an essential foundation for our common security.

4. The recently adopted decisions on strengthening the human dimension process as well as on the closer integration of the human dimension into the work of the Permanent Council create conditions for more focused discussions on issues of immediate concern to the OSCE community.

II. PRINCIPLES

1. The participating States reaffirm that their human dimension commitments are directly applicable and that States are accountable for their failure to respect the commitments they undertake.

2. The participating States, in accordance with the principle of accountability, recognize that they are responsible to their citizens and to one another for respect of OSCE norms and principles and for their implementation. Accountability implies the right of each citizen and

participating State to expect Governments to explain their actions and the commitment of Governments to respond to such requests. The participating States recognize their vested interest in exercising fully and robustly this right to raise concerns about the human rights situation in a participating State for the sake of peace, stability and prosperity in the OSCE area.

3. The participating States are fully committed to supporting continuing efforts of the ODIHR, the HCNM, the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media and the OSCE missions/field presences in enhancing respect for human dimension principles, norms and commitments, thus contributing to stability and security in the OSCE area, and to developing co-operation and complementarity of action with other organizations active in the area of human dimension concerns, in accordance with the Platform for Co-operative Security principles.

Main considerations that should be addressed in further work

III. DEMOCRACY BUILDING AND PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

1. The OSCE and its institutions and instruments should further develop practical programs to foster democratic institutions, human rights and the rule of law in the OSCE area. The ability to react in a flexible and quick manner to emerging needs should be increased and the participating States should be encouraged to forward their requests for assistance to the relevant OSCE institutions and instruments. In particular the ODIHR should develop further its short-term advisory missions (“democratization teams”).

2. The OSCE should develop close co-operation with other relevant international organizations and institutions, including the conduct of joint needs-assessment missions, consultations on the development of projects and co-operation wherever possible in implementing them.

3. Particular attention should be paid to the development of ombudsman/human rights protection institutions, which together with an independent judiciary can provide national remedies for human rights violations.

4. Manifestations of intolerance, aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, which may create a potential threat to peace and stability in the OSCE region, should continue to be tackled, and the participating States should mutually assist each other in efforts to combat them.

5. Further steps to ensure full equality of rights for women and men should be undertaken, including measures to ensure that where OSCE activities deal with issues affecting women and men in different ways full account is taken of gender-specific aspects. In particular the gender-related aspects of conflict prevention and crisis management should be analysed.

6. Measures to eliminate all forms of violence against women and children, in particular all forms of traffic and sexual exploitation, by, among other means, ensuring adequate legal protection against such acts, should be discussed. The ODIHR could be charged with collecting information provided by the participating States on the legislative and

administrative steps taken so far in this field and with reporting on this matter at OSCE meetings on implementation issues.

7. The need to combat all forms of prejudice and discrimination, *inter alia*, on the grounds of sex, race, ethnic origin, religion, or political conviction should be emphasized.

IV. ELECTIONS

1. Further steps should be taken to ensure that elections in the OSCE area are held in accordance with OSCE commitments. Moreover, the participating States should accept a commitment to invite international observers to elections below the national level.

2. Expression should be given to support for the enhancement of OSCE electoral assistance work and the strengthening of internal procedures to devise remedies against infringements of electoral rules, with the participating States invited to provide the ODIHR in a timely fashion with draft electoral laws and draft amendments to these laws for review so that possible comments can be taken into account in the legislative process.

3. The ODIHR should be ready to serve as an interagency co-ordinator in the electoral field and should be entrusted with continuing and developing its election-related activities, both in the area of assistance to participating States and observation of elections. The election methodology developed by the ODIHR, which has proven an efficient and reliable means of assessing whether elections are held in accordance with OSCE commitments, should be endorsed. The ODIHR should be given the task of continuing to observe elections in accordance with this methodology, which includes the observation of the entire electoral process, and the participating States should be ready to provide the necessary resources for this purpose, including candidates for key positions in election observation missions.

4. The participating States should follow-up promptly on the recommendations made by the ODIHR after an election. The ODIHR should offer to the State concerned its assistance in implementing those recommendations and should report to the Permanent Council on the status of their implementation.

V. NATIONAL MINORITIES

1. The participating States, reaffirming the importance of principle IV of the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States set out in the Helsinki Final Act, should ensure that persons belonging to national minorities enjoy all human rights and are able to exercise their fundamental freedoms both individually and in community with others. Failure by States to implement their commitments in this area has been a major cause of threats to security. At the same time, it has to be emphasized that national minorities must employ only peaceful means, such as elections, referendums, plebiscites and petitions, to exercise their rights.

2. The conditions for better protection and further promotion of the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identities of national minorities should be created.

3. In view of the repeated cases of forced migration and obstacles to return of refugees, highlighting to the gap between norms and their implementation, there is a need to reaffirm commitments in this area, as laid down in paragraph 10 of the Lisbon Declaration.

4. Self-administration is recognized as one of the means of protecting and promoting the identities of national minorities and to enhance their harmonious co-existence.

The participating States have evolved different forms of democratic government, ranging from federal to unitary systems. Some States are emphasizing the importance of constitutional citizenship based on equal rights as a fundamental prerequisite to deal with national minorities.

Self-administration may be implemented in different forms from case to case. In some cases, a maximum degree of self-administration may be necessary. The aspirations of national minorities should be asserted by peaceful means, the rights of other minorities should be respected and protected, and the territorial integrity of the State should not be called into question. In settlements where a national minority forms the majority, local self-administration should be implemented in such a way that the rights of other minorities living in the area are not infringed.

Subsidiarity in national or regional State structures and in the organization and administration of the State may also be considered as one of means of implementing the self-administration of national minorities.

5. Close co-operation between neighbouring States in cases where there are ethnic populations living on both sides of their common border in order to secure permanently mutual respect for their territorial integrity, should be encouraged.

6. The High Commissioner on National Minorities should be ready to offer participating States his good offices and to advise them on issues relating to the preparation of statutes for local self-administration.

7. Prominence should be given to the important role of bilateral and international agreements, in particular the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, in guaranteeing minority rights.

VI. INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

1. The Permanent Council should be encouraged to include human dimension issues in its weekly agenda in order to bring those issues into the forefront of OSCE concern.

2. In order to ensure that OSCE missions/field presences are sensitive to human dimension issues, mission members, including Heads and Deputy Heads of Missions, should receive training. The training should be geared toward the promotion of human rights as an integral part of conflict prevention. It should also sensitize Mission members to issues of equal rights for women and men, as well as to rights of persons belonging to national minorities.

3. The OSCE missions/field presences should be instructed to identify actions that should be undertaken by the State hosting the mission/field presence which would improve that State's compliance with OSCE human dimension commitments, and suggest how the ODIHR might bring its expertise to bear. To this end the ODIHR should assist missions/field presences in enhancing their human rights reporting and the appropriate lines of communications between the ODIHR and the missions/field presences should be further developed.

4. The ODIHR should concentrate its efforts on pragmatic and focused projects, in co-operation with participating States, other OSCE institutions and missions/field presences, as well as with the relevant international organizations. In view of the fact that many human dimension issues have economic or freedom of expression aspects and in order to maximize impact and avoid overlap, the ODIHR should co-ordinate its efforts with the Representative on Freedom of the Media and the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities.

5. The ODIHR should be encouraged and given sufficient resources to expand its focus to the all States in the OSCE area. ODIHR can play a key role in assisting the States strengthen judicial structures and electoral systems, and develop NGOs with the capability of addressing human rights and the integration of national minorities into mainstream society.

ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. The radical changes that have taken place during the last decade in Europe, in particular the end of bloc-to-bloc military confrontation, brought on the one hand an expansion of economic liberties and of the market economy, while on the other hand they focused increased attention on the non-military components of security - including those of an economic and environmental nature.

The new security situation, characterized by a multitude of risks and challenges affecting all participating States, calls for a comprehensive approach to security. Thus the economic and environmental questions should never be addressed in isolation or for their own sake but rather as an integral part of the efforts aiming at early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, for all of which the OSCE is a primary instrument in its area. Interlinkages between the economic and the human dimension are particularly relevant in this context. Democracy and the rule of law, as well as compliance with OSCE commitments in relation to human rights and the promotion of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, and compliance with the commitments undertaken within the economic dimension, all contribute to a stable political system which, in turn, is an essential factor for economic and social development and for the success of economic reforms.

2. The tangible link between prosperity and security has become increasingly evident in the OSCE area. This nexus is particularly marked in countries in the process of moving from planned to market-oriented economies. Achievement of an acceptable balance between long- and short-term needs, and the establishment of an economy that provides for a stable and adequate standard of living, contribute significantly to the reduction of political instability. In the wake of conflict, scarce resources and economic hardship work to heighten political tensions, impeding recovery efforts and diminishing the prospects of long-term peace. A transparent market economy may contribute to fostering respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of speech and religious tolerance.

II. PRINCIPLES

1. The participating States are committed to take the measures necessary for the early detection of security risks and challenges caused by economic, social and environmental problems.
2. The participating States are of the opinion that the OSCE's ability to cope with economic and environmental issues should be enhanced but in ways that neither duplicate existing efforts, nor replace efforts that could be more efficiently undertaken by other organizations or entities. In evaluating ways in which the OSCE can foster economic and environmental stability, there is a need to focus on those areas in which the OSCE has a clear advantage - e.g. establishing politically binding norms, creating political impetus for the implementation of these commitments, providing early warning, on-the ground monitoring, and co-ordination and mediation assistance.
3. The OSCE is uniquely qualified, through its broad membership, its consensual decision-making process, its on-site missions, and its unparalleled history as a norm-setting organization, to identify threats, focus political attention and foster co-operative responses. By improving its ability to address economic and environmental threats and opportunities, the OSCE would also improve its ability to prevent conflict and to foster prosperity throughout the OSCE area.
4. The participating States stress that general principles for international co-operation in areas covered by the economic and environmental dimension are:
 - promotion of a stable and transparent legal, institutional and regulatory framework and of the rule of law as essential conditions for economic actors to develop initiatives in trade, investment, finance, etc.;
 - shaping of international economic relations through bilateral and multilateral agreements. Membership in the relevant international organizations and adherence to the relevant international conventions is the most efficient way of securing the adoption and implementation of generally accepted rules and disciplines which help to develop economic co-operation; it is thus instrumental in achieving full integration of all participating States in the world economic system;
 - encouragement of various integration processes that are underway in Europe and throughout the world. These processes can prove beneficial for ensuring overall stability and security, provided they respect a certain number of criteria, such as voluntary participation, openness to all interested countries, transparency, non-discrimination, and conformity with rules and principles applicable world-wide;
 - securing of sustainable economic development by establishing a stable macroeconomic and financial framework, providing an appropriate standard of social security, protecting and preserving the environment, and creating the conditions for a solid scientific and technological base.

International co-operation based on the general principles referred to above should aim at achieving objectives that include progress towards:

- the free and orderly movement of goods, services, capital and persons;
- an integrated, modern infrastructure for transport, energy and telecommunications, open for competition;

- employment promotion policies as well as employment-related training, development of management skills and lifelong learning, with emphasis on international exchange programmes;
- co-operation in science and technology, with emphasis on preserving and developing the scientific potential and guaranteeing the protection of intellectual property;
- enhancing the role of civil society and NGOs in economic and social development as well as cross-border co-operation.

5. The participating States reiterate that the OSCE's economic and environmental dimension should provide political impetus to work carried out by specialized bodies. The OSCE - as a Europe-wide security organization - is well placed to provide such an impulse in support of the reform efforts necessary to permit the integration of economies in transition into the world economy.

To this end, close interaction between the various international organizations and institutions is required, since the new risks and challenges can be effectively confronted only through their combined expertise and resources. The OSCE should play a political role in reinforcing such interaction among all relevant international organizations and institutions as well as regional, sub-regional and transfrontier co-operation organizations and initiatives in accordance with the concept of the Platform for Co-operative Security.

The aim should be to enhance complementarity and promote synergies, thus making optimum use of available resources, while fully maintaining the independence of the individual organizations and institutions. The OSCE should concentrate its efforts on priority areas and retain its flexible approach in relation to tensions and crisis situations.

6. The participating States proceed from the conviction that promoting economic and social rights is of fundamental importance for ensuring that every individual can enjoy a decent life and develop freely. They also agree that the OSCE has an important role to play with regard to the promotion of human rights and democracy in supporting economic reform and social policy.

Main considerations that should be addressed in further work

III. OVERALL ROLE OF THE OSCE AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

1. The OSCE should, through its Institutions and in other ways, act as a forum in which economic and environmental issues can be raised, drawing upon expertise from all available sources.

2. Regular meetings of, and consultations among, senior representatives of the relevant organizations and institutions should be considered. This could help in co-ordinating their activities and, where necessary, their co-operative work programmes.

3. Regular review of the implementation of commitments, which makes it possible to identify difficulties and devise means of overcoming them within a co-operative approach, is of particular importance. The review process should be enhanced to make it as relevant as possible. The OSCE should build upon the already existing practice, according to which reviews of implementation may be conducted in the framework of the Economic Forum, at Review Conferences, or at special conferences held pursuant to a decision of the Permanent

Council. The results of such reviews should be brought to the attention of the OSCE decision-making bodies.

4. The Economic Forum, as well as the OSCE economic dimension seminars, should serve as forums for the exchange of information, experience and best practices, familiarization with OSCE principles and values, increase of public awareness, involvement of the business community and NGOs, dialogue on co-operative solutions, etc.

5. The Permanent Council, in its deliberations on economic and environmental issues, should focus its attention on identifying threats and priority areas and fostering co-operative responses.

6. The OSCE should be ready to identify and address domestic and transboundary environmental issues that may result in significant human and economic costs, and, *inter alia*, to foster regional or multilateral responses, acting, as appropriate, as a co-ordinating force by identifying key actors and agencies, providing political impetus, monitoring progress, and mediating as needed. Key issues that could be addressed in such a framework include: the allocation of shared natural resources; transboundary pollution, energy supply security, mass migration in response to environmental catastrophe, and regionally sustainable development plans.

IV. EARLY WARNING SYSTEM REGARDING ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS

1. The OSCE should, in co-operation with relevant organizations and institutions, take practical steps to develop a mechanism and a system of indicators that would provide early warning of the development of crisis phenomena in the economies of participating States.

The OSCE should focus on identifying the risks to security arising from economic, social and environmental problems, discussing their causes and potential consequences, and draw the attention of relevant international institutions to the need to take appropriate measures to alleviate the difficulties stemming from those risks. Rather than trying to match the economic expertise of a specialized organization, the OSCE should seek ways of using its strengths to add value where it has expertise.

2. The Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, acting under the authority of the Secretary General, should serve as a focal point for the OSCE's efforts to identify and address these threats.

Questions to be answered

(a) Is there a need/is it possible to establish a formal system/mechanism of indicators for identifying crisis situations?

(b) If yes, what should be the modalities of such a system/mechanism?

3. The OSCE Missions can play an important role in the early warning system. In their reports regarding economic and environmental issues, which could subsequently be debated by the Permanent Council, they should concentrate on identifying threats to security stemming from economic and environmental problems. This is to alert the State concerned, but also other Participating States, and specialized organizations, that there is an economic

problem that could, if untreated, or treated as a purely technical/financial difficulty, lead to a wider security problem, either within the state concerned or more widely.

V. POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION

1. The OSCE should assist the efforts of the international community in connection with post-conflict rehabilitation. The Chairman-in-Office should ensure that relevant international organizations are better informed about the needs of participating States experiencing difficulties in the post-conflict rehabilitation of civil society and the national economy.

2. The OSCE Missions/field presences should work with local authorities, international organizations, NGOs and financial institutions to develop and co-ordinate rational economic development programmes, as well as assisting local authorities in their efforts, *inter alia*, to make the transition to a free market economy, to develop regional and sub-regional strategies to foster economic stability, to provide a stable platform for broader policy goals and initiatives - also in multiethnic societies - to facilitate the return of refugees, and to support sustainable economic development.

VI. ROLE OF OSCE MISSIONS/FIELD PRESENCES

1. OSCE Missions/field presences should have the tools to monitor those threats to national or regional economic stability that have the potential to lead to instability, political turmoil, or even conflict. In this regard, attention should be paid to those issues that impede the development and maintenance of transparent market economies throughout the OSCE area, including (but not limited to): the impact of organized crime; lack of transparency in economic regulation; inadequate or confusing legal frameworks; haphazard application of laws; excessive government control/regulation of market forces; post-conflict economic collapse; threats to regional economic stability.

2. OSCE missions/field presences can also assist in fostering improved economic transparency.

3. Although the OSCE is not a scientific or technical organization, its Missions/field presences could still take a more proactive role with regard to environmental threats - specifically by identifying key environmental threats and flash points; focusing high-level attention at the PC on key problems and indicators; facilitating regional approaches to environmental issues both by focusing broad, high-level attention on key issues, and possibly through the mediation provided in expert discussions; providing assistance in co-ordination of external resources (funding, technical expertise, leveraging NGOs) to address specific threats; and fostering the development of environmentally-oriented NGOs.

PLATFORM FOR CO-OPERATIVE SECURITY, INCLUDING OSCE AS A FORUM FOR INTERACTION OF REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL GROUPINGS AND PEACEKEEPING

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. On the basis of paragraph 5(e) of the Copenhagen Decision, including the Common Concept, participating States agree that security in the OSCE area requires co-operation and

co-ordination among participating States and relevant organizations and institutions of which they are also members. Participating States wish to strengthen the non-hierarchical, mutually reinforcing nature of the relationship between those organizations and institutions, with a view to fostering a foundation for common, comprehensive and indivisible security in the OSCE area. To this end, they agree to co-operate on the basis of the Platform for Co-operative Security.

2. Through the Platform, participating States will develop complementary and mutually reinforcing relations between international organizations and institutions engaged in strengthening comprehensive security in the OSCE area. To this end, participating States agree to encourage mutual trust and transparency in relations between international organizations and institutions through dialogue, exchange of information, co-operation and co-ordination.

3. Paragraph 5(e) of the Copenhagen Decision, including the Common Concept, represents an important step forward in the development of the Platform, and the main focus should now be on identifying practical aspects of co-operation and on preparing the ground for further development of the principles in the Common Concept.

II. BASIC CONCEPTS

1. The Platform is concerned with promotion of comprehensive security.

2. The principles of the Platform apply to any organization or institution concerned with comprehensive security whose members individually and collectively decide to adhere to it.

3. The development of the Platform should take place in the overall context of the role of the OSCE as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

4. The Platform is based on the concept that no one organization can, by itself, effectively address the multifaceted challenges to security. An effective interplay is required.

5. Mutual co-operation should be based on a non-hierarchical approach. At the same time, there is a need to maintain and further develop political and operational coherence among all bodies dealing with security challenges.

6. The comparative advantages of each organization should be utilized and strengthened. Each organization should concentrate on the tasks it can do best.

7. The OSCE could serve as a flexible framework for inter-institutional co-operation. This role of the OSCE should be further clarified and developed.

III. CONTACTS AND CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

1. In Copenhagen, participating States agreed on practical steps towards further development of co-operation between the OSCE and those bodies which subscribe to the Common Concept: regular contacts, including meetings, through a regular framework for dialogue, increased transparency and practical co-operation, including identification of liaison officers or points of contact, cross-representation at appropriate meetings and other contacts intended to increase understanding of each organization's conflict prevention tools.
2. As a follow-up to the above mentioned Decision, including the Common Concept, the Secretariat has established practical co-operation with several organizations, both at headquarters level and in the field.
3. Co-operation with the Council of Europe is well advanced through, *inter alia*, structured meetings at the level of Ministers and Secretaries General. This co-operation has reinforced the Platform as a central component of co-operation between the two bodies. The tripartite meetings between the OSCE, the United Nations and the Council of Europe and the "2+2" meetings between the OSCE and the Council of Europe constitute other examples of co-operation at a high level.
4. The Secretariat has also established contact with the European Commission and the Western European Union, and deliberations on various forms for co-operation at headquarters level as well as in the field have started.
5. The co-operation with NATO has intensified: the OSCE Chairmanship, the Troika and the Secretariat have all visited Brussels, and representatives of NATO have visited Vienna to meet their counterparts. A central theme in these meetings has been to increase practical co-operation in connection with crisis situations in areas where both organizations are involved.
6. With some other international organizations the OSCE has also developed extensive co-operation in the field, *inter alia*, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Kosovo.
7. In order to further improve the co-operation with other organizations, in line with the above-mentioned decision from Copenhagen, two informal meetings with other international organizations were held in Vienna during the course of 1998. On 3 July NATO, WEU, the Council of Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States participated, and on 29 October the following United Nations agencies took part: UNDP, OCHA, UNHCR, UNHCHR, IAEA, ODCCP and UNESCO. Both meetings provided an opportunity for a discussion of experience derived from co-operation and contacts in the past, and possible improvements for the future, with special focus on co-operation in the field. At the meetings the need for pragmatic co-operation, based on the principle of utilization of comparative advantages, was emphasized. At the same time, there was agreement that co-operation would have to be based on the principle of equal status of the various organizations and on recognition of their distinctive characteristics.
8. As a means of further intensifying the dialogue between the OSCE and other international organizations and institutions, participating States agree that special meetings could be convened on a regular basis. Such meetings may take place in a technical format, including consultations between officials from the secretariats, or in a political format to bring together representatives of participating States as well as officials from the secretariats.

IV. OSCE AS A FORUM FOR REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL INTERACTION

Basic principles

1. In the Copenhagen Decision Ministers agreed to offer the OSCE as a potential forum for interaction of regional and subregional groupings in the OSCE area, with the aim of facilitating exchanges of information and of developing a pragmatic approach to addressing challenges, including those arising in the field of post-conflict rehabilitation.

2. Regional/subregional approaches to security have become a central part of overall efforts to provide for security and stability in the OSCE area. Regional/subregional co-operation aimed at serving local needs, solving local problems and building mutual confidence among States in individual regions constitutes a valuable contribution to the overall security of the OSCE community.

The work on a Document-Charter offers an opportunity to further utilize the potential of the regional/subregional dimension as an integral part of the Organization's activity and thereby contribute to the indivisibility of security in the whole OSCE area. Furthermore, the Document-Charter should offer a framework and general principles for regional/subregional co-operation on a non-hierarchical basis, encourage new processes, interrelate these processes and assure their coherence with the work and norms of the OSCE.

3. However, the Document-Charter should not aim at establishing a rigorous, inflexible framework encompassing an exhaustive list of any kind of regional/subregional co-operation, as such co-operation depends on a variety of regional/subregional circumstances.

4. Regional/subregional approaches to security should be based on the following considerations:

- indivisibility and comprehensiveness of security;
- the regional/subregional dimension as an integral part of common security in the OSCE area;
- transparency;
- participation on a voluntary basis;
- regional/subregional approaches compatible with and complementary to wider co-operative security frameworks, on a non-hierarchical basis;
- regional/subregional approaches compatible with the global system of collective security as defined in the Charter of the United Nations;
- in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, states directly concerned should act first;
- regional/subregional efforts respond to specific regional/subregional demands;
- no leading status for any one State;
- regional/subregional processes not at the expense of third parties;

- compliance with norms and commitments provided by the OSCE.

The role of the OSCE

A number of suggestions have been made on the OSCE as a forum for regional and subregional interaction:

- The Document-Charter should include an indicative list of possible areas for regional/subregional or bilateral co-operation, without necessarily creating new institutions. Such a list could include, *inter alia*, the following areas: Protection of national minorities, border co-operation, measures in the areas of political, (including with regard to so called new risks and challenges) economic, humanitarian, educational, environmental and cultural co-operation as well as arms control and confidence- and security-building measures.
- Furthermore, both the OSCE as an organization as well as the individual participating States may take concrete steps to further utilize the potential of the regional/subregional dimension.
- The OSCE should support and encourage regional/subregional efforts by participating States, and contribute with information to all other OSCE participating States about ongoing regional/subregional processes.
- Based on the concept of solidarity, the OSCE should stand ready to support regional/subregional activities, upon request by States participating in such processes. On request, OSCE instruments such as the CPC, ODIHR, HCNM, and the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media should provide expert advice for regional processes.
- The OSCE will facilitate implementation of agreements concluded under its aegis or with its support, and will also stand ready to fulfil a repository function for regional/subregional agreements.
- On request of the States participating in subregional processes, the OSCE may exercise the powers and functions of a guarantor for the implementation of regional/subregional agreements and decisions.
- The OSCE will endeavour to ensure that the development of co-operation within the regional/subregional dimension of security does not entail the strengthening of the security of certain regions/subregions at the expense of the security of other regions/subregions.
- The Permanent Council should, on a regular basis, review progress achieved in regional/subregional processes and determine new areas as well as recommend forms of regional/subregional efforts.
- The OSCE may decide to establish a Conference of Subregional Organizations and Associations in order to exchange experience and ensure the broadest possible examination of issues involved in maintaining stability and security in the OSCE area. The Conference will meet in session once every two years at the headquarters of the OSCE, and the Conference may recommend to the OSCE the implementation of specific projects and programmes aimed at strengthening security and co-operation

within the OSCE area and at enhancing the effectiveness of the regional/subregional dimension in the work of the OSCE.

Many of the above-mentioned suggestions will need to be discussed further.

The role of participating States

The following suggestions have been made of the role of participating States in connection with regional and subregional groupings:

1. Participating States will seek to ensure that the aims, principles and norms of regional/subregional agreements, organizations, arrangements and initiatives in which they participate are consistent with OSCE principles and norms.
2. Participating States will exchange experience among various regional/subregional structures in which they are participating as a means of enhancing benefits obtained from regional/subregional interaction elsewhere in the OSCE area. To this effect, participating States should keep the OSCE and the Secretary General informed about their activities.
3. Participating States will co-operate with the OSCE, its institutions and representatives.
4. Participating States will refrain from supporting States that seriously contravene OSCE principles and commitments.

V. THE OSCE ROLE IN CONNECTION WITH PEACEKEEPING (IN THE LIGHT OF THE OVERALL OSCE ROLE IN CONFLICT PREVENTION)

The guidelines on an OSCE Document-Charter on European Security (Copenhagen Decision No. 5, paragraph 5, last section of subparagraph (e)) task us to rigorously examine the OSCE's appropriate role connected with peacekeeping operations, bearing in mind relevant OSCE documents.

Principles and definitions

1. Examination of the OSCE's role in connection with peacekeeping should be based on earlier decisions and documents. However, this cannot be done in a vacuum; due account must be taken of the developments that have taken place in the recent years in the field of peacekeeping, and also of the OSCE's own evolutionary process.
2. The Helsinki Document 1992, Chapter III on Instruments of Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management, paragraph 17, states that:

"Peacekeeping constitutes an important operational element of the overall capability of the CSCE for conflict prevention and crisis management intended to complement the political process of dispute resolution. CSCE peacekeeping activities may be undertaken in cases of conflict within or among participating States to help maintain peace and stability in support of an ongoing effort at a political solution."
3. The Helsinki Document 1992, in its Chapter III on Instruments of Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management, Paragraphs (18), (22), (23), (24) and (25), sets forth a set of principles applicable to the OSCE's possible involvement in peacekeeping operations. As

such, they are in conformity with the United Nations definition of the term "peacekeeping" as set forth in the Secretary General's "Agenda for Peace" (1992).

4. Budapest Document 1994 Chapter I, on Strengthening the CSCE, reads as follows:

"3. The Heads of State or Government have directed that the future role and functions of the CSCE will include the following:

9. - to further its principles and develop its capabilities in conflict resolution, crisis management and peacekeeping and in post-conflict rehabilitation, including assisting with reconstruction;"

5. In the Budapest Document reference is also made to a possible OSCE peacekeeping operation in the event of a peace agreement in the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. In paragraph 4 of Chapter II, Regional Issues, it is stated that the settlement of the conflict would make it possible to deploy multinational peacekeeping forces as an essential element for the implementation of such an agreement. In this context, it was decided that a High-Level Planning Group should be established, with the task, among other things, of making recommendations on the size and characteristics of the force, command and control and logistics.

6. The discussions have revealed two different interpretations of the Copenhagen Decision regarding peacekeeping and its relation to other CSCE and OSCE documents, such as the Helsinki Document 1992 and the Budapest Document 1994. According to one position, the ministers in Copenhagen mandated a critical examination of earlier decisions based on experience gained in cases such as Bosnia. Another approach is that these earlier decisions are valid and should therefore not be questioned. The lack of a common understanding on this issue has influenced the discussion of the topic, since it is closely linked to the overall question of the role which the OSCE should have in the field of peacekeeping.

7. In the discussion, a number of terms, such as "peacekeeping operations", "peace enforcement operations", "peace operations" and "conflict settlement activities" are used, often interchangeably. There is a lack of clear definition or understanding of these terms. In the discussion some delegations have underlined a need for taking into account the development of peacekeeping during the last decade. According to this view, the "classical" or more traditional form of peacekeeping is now replaced by multidimensional and complex operations embracing both military and civilian tasks. Instability is seen as a continuum progressing from political, economic, and military stability first to tensions, then to full-blown crisis, then on open conflict, to post-conflict management and rehabilitation, and, finally to a restoration of stability. Experience from Bosnia-Herzegovina seems to support this argument.

It follows from this perspective that different organizations are differently equipped to deal with different stages of the continuum, and that the appropriate point for their engagement is usually best determined by their comparative advantages.

8. The report by the NACC Ad Hoc Working Group on Co-operation in Peacekeeping to the meeting of the NACC in Athens, Greece, on 11 June 1993, could also serve as a useful basis for seeking a common or universal definition of the term "peacekeeping". In part I, 1, Definitions, it is stated that there is no single generally accepted definition of peacekeeping.

However, reference is made to Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter, which traditionally has laid the foundation for the United Nations understanding of the term "peacekeeping". In this context we must remember that the term as such is not mentioned in the Charter. Peacekeeping operations - as they developed during the years immediately following the adoption of the United Nations Charter - are rooted in the basic principle of peaceful settlement of conflicts, as described in this Chapter.

OSCE and peacekeeping - On what terms?

1. The discussion of an OSCE role in connection with peacekeeping has been based on three major contributions.
2. According to one view, the OSCE should not play a military role in peacekeeping operations, since other international organizations or coalitions of States have the necessary capabilities for conducting such operations. Establishing a military capability within the OSCE framework would for all practical purposes be a duplication of other organizations' capabilities and resources. The OSCE has proven its capabilities in "Conflict Prevention" and "Humanitarian Assistance", which require no military resources but rather civilian personnel and tasks.
3. Another view is that the OSCE should adopt measures to enhance its capabilities for peacekeeping operations, including the performance of its own peacekeeping operations, participation in such operations conducted by decision of the United Nations, and also the enlistment of other organizations and groups of States for OSCE peacekeeping operations. According to this position the OSCE participating States should also designate or earmark military units that can be deployed as OSCE peacekeeping contingents. These contingents would include national military, police and civilian personnel. Furthermore, it is foreseen that a single military command structure would be established under the Permanent Council and the OSCE Secretariat.
4. This suggestion contradicts the views of a number of other delegations. In their view, this would duplicate the resources and structures that are established in other international organizations and contexts. Reference is also made to the Platform and the view that the OSCE should concentrate on activities where it has shown itself to have comparative advantages.
5. The third approach around which a common understanding may be emerging is conceptually based on the Helsinki Document 1992. It divides the OSCE's involvement in peacekeeping into three categories:

The OSCE and multifunctional peace operations

In such operations the OSCE should make contributions in areas where it has comparative advantages.

The OSCE requests support from other organizations for conducting peacekeeping operations on its behalf

Such a request would require the Permanent Council (PC) to set the general objectives of the operation and the supporting organization would have to report periodically to the PC on progress achieved in implementing its mandate.

OSCE-led operations

Although this scenario, in which the OSCE would be asked to take on an operational responsibility for a military peacekeeping operation, at present seems unlikely, the possibility should not be excluded. In the first instance, however, the OSCE should seek to make use of capabilities available in other organizations building on the Platform for Co-operative Security. As was made clear by the Helsinki Document 1992, OSCE-led operations could only be conducted with the consent of the parties directly concerned and would not entail enforcement actions.

6. In this compromising view the OSCE's peacekeeping activities are regarded as an integral part of the whole cycle of the Organization's conflict settlement activities. Every option is kept open. The organizational and operational structures of any kind of operation should be decided by the task at hand, the goal of avoiding duplication of effort being kept in mind.

7. Most delegations have stressed the need to keep all options open. According to this view, one should not exclude the possibility of the OSCE performing a peacekeeping operation including military tasks and forces.

The relationship between the OSCE and other international organizations - hierarchical or equal?

1. In the Common Concept for the development of co-operation between mutually reinforcing institutions, adopted in Copenhagen, the OSCE participating States committed themselves to working on a co-operative basis with other organizations and institutions that are prepared to deploy their resources in support of the OSCE's work. Particular attention was drawn to co-operation in conflict prevention and crisis management.

2. One position appears to underline the idea that the OSCE should play a leading role in its area by comparison with other European and Euro-Atlantic organizations, and this, in the view of some delegations, suggests a hierarchical relationship between the organizations. What we are referring to here is the term "collective security", which - according to some delegations - indicates a hierarchical system of organizations. A number of delegations prefer the term "co-operative security", which suggests a more equal and pragmatic relationship between the organizations.

3. In the discussion so far, the experience acquired in Albania has been highlighted. This experience has shown that the OSCE can provide a co-ordinating framework for the combined "soft" peacekeeping efforts of other members of the international community. The Platform should be the primary tool for the promotion of dialogue and co-operation, ensuring coherence and avoiding duplication of effort among the institutions, organizations and countries concerned.

4. A number of other delegations have also stressed the importance of the Platform and the Common Concept, with regard to peacekeeping operations, as in other contexts.

Mandates for peacekeeping operations

1. Another important question that needs clarification relates to the role of OSCE mandates. One view is that the OSCE is not in a position to accept mandates other than for its own field activities. NATO or other international organizations could therefore, according

to this view, launch a peacekeeping operation without prior approval and/or mandate from the OSCE. An OSCE mandate is not a prerequisite for an international community action. However, a political endorsement from the OSCE is seen as desirable.

2. Another position is that a mandate from the OSCE or the United Nations Security Council is needed, even in circumstances where the OSCE itself does not play an active role in the operation. The OSCE as a regional organization under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter is highlighted, and a mandate from the OSCE is seen as being of crucial importance both for the legitimacy of the operation and also as a sign of respect for the validity of international law. Peace enforcement, however, would require special authorization by the Security Council.

3. According to the third approach there is no legal requirement for an OSCE request to be based on a Security Council resolution, as any action taken will be with the consent of the parties to the conflict. However, it would be politically desirable to secure full Security Council support for OSCE peacekeeping operations wherever possible.

The way ahead

1. There seems to be broad agreement that the OSCE has a vital role to play in connection with multifunctional peacekeeping operations in areas where it has comparative advantages.

Most delegations seem to agree that the OSCE has no role to play in connection with peace-enforcement operations.

2. There seems, furthermore, to be broad agreement that the possibility of the OSCE requesting other organizations to make their resources available should be kept open.

3. There may be an emerging common understanding on the advisability of keeping the options open with regard to OSCE-led military peacekeeping.

4. There is no agreement on the proposal to earmark military units for OSCE peacekeeping contingents and to set up a single military command structure under the Permanent Council and the OSCE Secretariat.

VI. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLATFORM

1. There is a need for more transparency with regard to activities of other organizations. Improved exchange of information, including regular contacts and liaison arrangements, will improve transparency and help avoid overlapping, double-work and misperceptions. In the further development of the Platform, important developments in other forums, such as NATO/EAPC/PfP, EU, WEU and the Council of Europe, must be taken fully into account.

2. Practical experience (Bosnia, Albania and Kosovo) indicates that conflict prevention and crisis management will be a main focus of the Platform's operational value in the short term.

3. A proposal to establish formal framework agreements between the OSCE and other international organizations as a basis for co-operation at all levels has not found agreement.

4. Issues of comprehensive security cannot be regarded as belonging to any single dimension. The Platform should be multidimensional, including, among others, the human dimension and the economic dimension. At the same time, in broadening its scope, it is important to avoid a dilution of the Platform concept by attempting to apply the same arrangements to all other organizations equally.

Practical modalities through which the Platform can be developed.

5. Co-operation between the OSCE and other organizations in the human dimension should be further promoted. The Council of Europe and the competent United Nations agencies are especially relevant in this regard, and representation of certain organizations at future implementation meetings could lead to closer co-operation.

6. Co-operation between the OSCE and other organizations is also an important means of assisting participating States in their compliance with OSCE commitments. Specific measures to this end could include, *inter alia*, participating States inviting organizations of which they are members to inform the OSCE of measures taken to assist compliance with OSCE commitments, or examining ways in which these organizations could directly assist the OSCE in specific cases.

7. In line with the Platform principles, police activities should be based on close co-ordination and utilization of comparative advantages.

8. The Platform should also enable the OSCE and other organizations to enhance, in a coherent manner, continuing and future efforts in the economic dimension.

9. With regard to new risks and challenges, stress is laid on the fact that the approach should be differentiated depending on the nature and specific characteristics of the risks.

10. The potential of the OSCE to assist Central Asian States, through the Platform and in co-operation with other international organizations, should be further explored.

SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN ADJACENT AREAS. CO-OPERATION WITH PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. The OSCE participating States have on a number of occasions declared that strengthening of security and co-operation in adjacent areas, particularly in the Mediterranean region, is of great importance for the stability of the OSCE region.

2. The Mediterranean partners have been involved in the Organization's activities in one way or another since the start of the CSCE/OSCE process. Since the Budapest Summit of 1994 the dialogue has been institutionalized in regular meetings of the Mediterranean Contact Group. The Mediterranean partners for co-operation (MPC) today comprise Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Israel and Jordan.

3. Japan and the Republic of Korea have enjoyed a status somewhat different from that of the MPC. They were recognized as "partners for co-operation" in December 1995.

4. While the MPC receive invitations to attend meetings on a case-by-case basis, Japan has, since the Helsinki Summit in 1992, had a permanent invitation to attend all meetings of the CSCE/OSCE (Summit, Ministerial Council, Senior Council and Permanent Council meetings). Japan is given the opportunity to make contributions without taking part in the decision-making process.

II. PRINCIPLES

1. In the Guidelines on an OSCE Document-Charter on European Security, adopted at the Copenhagen Ministerial Council meeting, the participating States referred to their relations with the partners for co-operation (Decision No. 5, paragraph 5 (j)), as follows:

“Recognizing the indivisibility of security, they affirm that strengthening security and co-operation in adjacent areas, in particular the Mediterranean, is an important factor for stability in the OSCE area. They will consider closer co-operation with all partners for co-operation in order to promote the norms and values shared by the OSCE participating States. They will also encourage partners to draw on OSCE expertise.”

2. On this basis it would seem that there is general agreement on the necessity - even the desirability - of expanding co-operation with the partners. In the discussion so far, a number of concrete proposals have been put forward with respect to both the content of the co-operation and the modalities for implementing it.

III. CO-OPERATION WITH THE MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

1. In the Budapest Decision (1994) it is stated that: “In order to consider proposals that originate in the Contact Group, seminars and high-level consultations, the Chairman-in-Office will invite during the course of the year representatives of these non-participating Mediterranean States, as appropriate, to any meetings of the Permanent Council solely devoted to ‘Mediterranean Issues’, or to the Senior Council when “Mediterranean Issues” are placed on the agenda. The Chairman of the Forum for Security Co-operation, with the consensus of the participating States, may also invite representatives of these non-participating Mediterranean States to meetings devoted to ‘Mediterranean Issues’.”

2. The Lisbon Document 1996 states that: “We are committed to further developing the dialogue with our Mediterranean partners for co-operation, Japan, and the Republic of Korea. In this context, strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean is important for stability in the OSCE region. We welcome the continued interest displayed by the Mediterranean partners for co-operation, Japan, and the Republic of Korea in the OSCE, and the deepening of dialogue and co-operation with them. We invite them to participate in our activities, including meetings as appropriate.”

3. A number of concrete proposals have been tabled with respect to co-operation with the MPC. It has been stated that the interest in security and co-operation in the Mediterranean has increased considerably in recent years. It is also noted that the OSCE needs to seek ways of making a specific contribution to stability in regions adjacent to the OSCE area, based on a non-discriminatory approach.

4. A number of delegations have underlined that the dialogue with the MPC should not interfere with the activities of other existing structures such as the Barcelona Euro-Mediterranean process. This process is regarded by a group of participating States as the primary vehicle for dialogue between the EU and all States of the Mediterranean region (not only the MPC).
5. A group of countries has enumerated a number of ideas regarding strengthened co-operation with the MPC. These are:
 - (a) The substantive content of the informal open-ended Contact Group's work should be increased. The Group was established within the framework of the Permanent Council at the Budapest Summit in 1994. The agenda could be expanded to include, in addition, the question of implementing OSCE commitments in all areas with a view to encouraging the partners to respect the OSCE's basic values. The partners could benefit from experience in areas such as the human dimension, regional co-operation and confidence- and security-building measures.
 - (b) The MPC should be encouraged to contribute to OSCE activities:
 - By proposing subjects relevant to the OSCE's sphere of competence for discussion, drawing inspiration from the expertise of the ODIHR and the CPC;
 - By sending guest observers for election-monitoring operations or by sending representatives for short-term visits to OSCE missions in accordance with Permanent Council Decision No. 233.
 - (c) Possibilities for increasing local awareness of the OSCE by arranging conferences and seminars should be further exploited.
 - (d) The procedures for participation by the MPC in the work and meetings of the OSCE should be improved. Concrete proposals in this respect are invitations to Summit and Ministerial Council meetings, invitations - at the expense of the MPC themselves - to all seminars organized by the OSCE, invitations to attend certain meetings of the Permanent Council, invitations to attend as observers some of the meetings of the Security Model Committee and, lastly, participation as observers in certain meetings of the Forum for Security Co-operation, FSC Implementation meetings, Review Meetings and meetings concerning the human dimension and the economic dimension.
6. Other proposals have been put forward, focusing also on the institutional and procedural aspects - and possible results - of co-operation with the MPC:
 - Through the Document-Charter one should offer the OSCE's expertise for the establishment of structures and mechanisms in the Mediterranean analogous to those already existing within the OSCE for conflict prevention, early warning and preventive diplomacy;
 - The OSCE should invite the Mediterranean partners for co-operation to the plenary meetings of the Permanent Council, the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Security Model Committee;

- The OSCE should establish an MPC-CPC information exchange with the aim of setting up a Mediterranean Conflict Prevention Centre;
- The OSCE should promote the establishment of a sub-regional arrangement for confronting, in a more focused manner, the economic, demographic, social, cultural and environmental problems already threatening the region. Such a mechanism could help in developing and elaborating a sustainable network of confidence- and security-building measures;
- The implementation of commitments under the economic dimension relevant for the Mediterranean region should be considered;
- The human dimension is also a field for potential constructive co-operation with the MPC. The OSCE could utilize experience gathered by the ODIHR and the HCNM.

Some of the above proposals will have to be discussed further.

IV. CO-OPERATION WITH PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION (JAPAN AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA)

1. It has been suggested that strengthened co-operation with Japan and the Republic of Korea could, in particular, be related to the regional security dimension. Joint activities in connection with field missions in Central Asia are regarded as the most visible initial feature of the Euro-Asian co-operation.

2. Closer contacts, as called for by Japan, could be considered in connection with the Asia Regional Forum (ARF), which is regarded as the OSCE's closest counterpart in Asia.

These ideas need further clarification and elaboration.

V. ISSUES FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

1. In the discussion on co-operation in adjacent areas, there seems to be broad consensus on the need for further strengthening of the co-operation with partner States. Special stress is laid on the need for giving the co-operation and dialogue more substance and content.

2. The discussion up till now has to a considerable degree focused on co-operation with the MPC. Even though the importance of this is not questioned, concern has been voiced regarding the balance between co-operation with the MPC and the other partners for co-operation.

This will probably not be a question of "either-or" but rather of finding an appropriate balance between co-operation with the MPC and the other partner States.

3. Some of the proposals tabled have concrete procedural and/or institutional implications. This is a point that needs further elaboration and clarification, as some delegations have opposed the creation of new institutions or organizational structures within the OSCE. However, there seems to be broad agreement on the need to vitalize the regular meetings of the Contact Group for the MPC. Some steps have already been taken, for example by arranging a special session of the Contact Group dedicated to the work on the Document-Charter.

VI. CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER NON-PARTICIPATING STATES

It is agreed that the OSCE should also be receptive to applications for co-operation with the OSCE by other non-participating States. This is regarded as necessary in order to develop the regional security dimension and to involve all States concerned with regional security in the OSCE area. Applications for closer links with the OSCE should be examined on a case-by-case basis.

INDICATIVE LIST OF CONTACTS BETWEEN
THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OSCE AND INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS IN 1998

3-4 December (Strasbourg): Participation of Personal Adviser of the representative on Freedom of the Media in Steering Committee on Mass Media of the Council of Europe.

23-26 November: Visit to the Trans-Caucasus States, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, by the Chairman-in-Office, with the participation of representatives of the European Commission and the Council of Europe.

20-26 November (Brussels): WEU organized CRISEX 1998 - a high level Crisis Management Exercise to which the OSCE, EU, United Nations and NATO were invited as observers.

20 November (Warsaw): Seminar on "Lessons identified and learned from Peace-keeping Missions", organized by the Ministry of National Defence of Poland, and attended by representatives of the United Nations, NATO, WEU and several high-level military experts from OSCE participating States.

20 November (Geneva): Humanitarian Issues Working Group of the Peace Implementation Council chaired by the UNHCR, attended by representatives of the OSCE, NATO, European Commission, Council of Europe, ICRC, among others.

19 November (Vienna): Addresses by Mr. Daniel Tarschys, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, and Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, the Director-General of the United Nations Office in Geneva to the Permanent Council.

13 November (Geneva): Preparatory meeting with the participation of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the OSCE Secretariat and the UN/ECE for the parliamentary conference on "Regional and sub-regional economic co-operation", to be held in Nantes, in October 1999.

10-11 November (Sarajevo): Workshop to discuss the future work of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina, including the 1999 municipal elections, and the Mission's human rights and democratization programmes, with the participation of UNHCR, ECMM, United Nations Civil Affairs (UNCA), International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES) and SFOR (Stabilization Force).

6 November (Geneva): consultations among the OSCE, UNHCHR, UNHCR and ICRC to discuss practical co-operation in Kosovo.

6 November (Vienna): OSCE - NATO/SHAPE consultations between staff members of the KVM Support Unit and the OSCE Secretariat and representatives of NATO Headquarters and SHAPE - exchange of information on the preparations of the respective operations in and around Kosovo, and discussion on modalities for co-operation.

5-6 November (Istanbul): OSCE Economic Dimension Seminar on “Regional Environmental Problems and Co-operative Approaches to Solving Them - The Case of the Black Sea Region” with the participation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Black Sea Economic Co-operation, Black Sea Environment Programme, United Nations Development Programme, and the Danube Commission.

5 November (Warsaw): ODIHR convened target-oriented Meeting on Kosovo with the participation of the delegations of the Contact Group countries, United Nations agencies, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, ICRC, Council of Europe and the European Commission.

4 November (Strasbourg): participation of the Chairman-in-Office at the 103rd session of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

3 November (Brussels): OSCE - NATO consultations on current conceptual issues within the two organizations, in particular on the work of the OSCE Document Charter on European Security, the NATO Strategic Concept and discussions on NATO's role in peacekeeping, the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the crisis in Kosovo (OSCE delegation was headed by the Chairman of the Permanent Council).

30 October (Tirana): “Tirana International Conference” with the participation of the Chairman-in-Office and the OSCE Presence in Albania, as well as by representatives of United Nations, NATO, WEU, European Commission, Council of Europe, IMF, World Bank, EBRD, European Investment Bank.

29 October (Vienna): Special informal meeting of the Security Model Committee with the participation of representatives of United Nations Agencies - UNDP, UNHCR, UNDCP, UNHCHR, IAEA, Office for Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and UNESCO.

26 October - 6 November (Warsaw): Human Dimension Implementation Meeting with the participation of the following organizations: UNESCO, UNDP, UNHCHR, UNHCR, International Labour Organization, European Commission, Council of Europe, EBRD, ICRC.

23 October (Mons): OSCE - NATO/SHAPE consultations on the preparation of the Kosovo Verification Mission. Subsequent meetings were held on 29-30 October 1998 in Vienna, and on 19 November 1998 in Mons.

23 October (Vienna): Reinforced meeting of the Permanent Council on regional issues, to which representatives from the United Nations, UNHCR, UNDP, Council of Europe, EBRD, Black Sea Economic Co-operation, and the ICRC, were invited.

19-20 October (Malta): OSCE Mediterranean Seminar on “The Human Dimension of Security, Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law” with the participation of the Chairman-in-Office representatives and the OSCE Secretary General, as well as UNHCR, NATO, WEU, European Commission, Council of Europe, and the Mediterranean Forum.

19 October (New York): Meeting on the implementation of the prohibitions contained in Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998) and 1199 (1998), of the participating regional organizations, organized by the Department for Peacekeeping operations, and the United Nations Secretariat with the participation of the European Union, NATO, OSCE, WEU, and the Danube Commission.

18-20 October (Locarno): "International Conference on Governance and Participation - Integrating Diversity" organized by the HCNM and ODIHR with the participation of UNDP, UNESCO, UNHCR, European Commission, Council of Europe, and the Council of Baltic Sea States.

15 October (Vienna): Address by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to the Permanent Council. On the same day, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the OSCE Secretariat and the UNHCR.

13-14 October (Stockholm): International Conference on OSCE and Sub-regional Groups: Co-operation between Mutually reinforcing Institutions organized by the Chairman-in-Office, and the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs in co-operation with East-West Institute, attended by representatives of the European Commission, WEU, Black Sea Economic Co-operation and Central European Initiative.

13 October (Rome): Participation of the OSCE Secretariat representatives in the meeting of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union.

7 October (Vienna): Informal meeting of the Permanent Council on the Implementation of the Programme of Action of the CIS Migration Conference, with the participation of representatives of IOM, Department for Migration and Humanitarian Affairs, UNHCR, and ICRC.

5-6 October (Athens): NATO organized "Seminar on Peacekeeping" with the participation of the OSCE Secretariat.

30 September (Brussels): Inaugural meeting of the "Friends of Albania", chaired by the OSCE in co-operation with the EU Council Secretariat.

22-24 September (Tashkent): OSCE Economic Dimension Seminar "Regional Environmental Problems and Co-operative Approaches to Solving Them" with the participation of the Chairman-in-Office representatives and the OSCE Secretary General, and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, International Atomic Energy Agency, International Committee of the Red Cross, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, OECD, Interstate Council of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea, Asian Development Bank and the World Bank.

23 September: Joint OSCE, EU, Council of Europe, and WEU Declaration, regarding the dramatic events in Tirana which involved widespread violence.

19 September (Tirana): OSCE/Council of Europe Ministerial Mission to Albania (with the participation of the Chairman-in-Office, the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, Secretaries General of the OSCE and the Council of Europe, and the Special Envoy of the European Union Presidency to Albania).

17-18 September (Brussels): NATO organized "Roundtable on Caspian Oil/Gas and International Security", with the participation of representatives of the OSCE Secretariat.

15 September (Vienna): Briefing by the Director of Crisis Management and Operations of NATO to the OSCE Troika and the OSCE Secretariat on NATO planning for military operations in connection with the crisis in Kosovo.

15 September (Tbilisi): Workshop on recommendations of international organizations concerning the return of persons displaced as a result of the Georgian - South Ossetian conflict, organized by the ODIHR in co-operation with the Directorate of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe.

7-10 September (The Hague): Informal meeting on the issues relating to the Meskhetian Turks, organized by the HCNM, in co-operation with UNHCR and the Open Society Institute (Forced Migration Project).

28-29 July (New York): "Third Meeting between the United Nations and Regional Organizations", with the participation of the Secretary General of the OSCE.

16 July (Vienna): "2+2" meeting between the OSCE and the Council of Europe at the level of Political Directors (with the participation of representatives of the "Troikas", Parliamentary Assemblies and the OSCE Institutions).

15-16 July (Paris): Joint OSCE/OECD conference on "National and International Approaches to Improving Integrity and Transparency in Government".

13 July (Skopje): Meeting of the Chairmanship, CPC and senior staff of OSCE Missions to BiH, Croatia, Skopje and Albania, with UNHCR, on regional refugee issues relevant to the activities of the OSCE.

7 July (Vienna): Pilot meeting between the OSCE and NATO on early warning and conflict prevention.

3 July (Vienna): Special informal meeting of the OSCE Security Model Committee with other international organizations (WEU, NATO, CIS, CoE).

1-2 July (Chisinau): OSCE Seminar on the Interrelationship between Central and Regional governments, with the participation of UNDP, UNHCR, European Commission, EBRD, World Bank, CoE, Assembly of the European Regions and ICRC.

26 June (Kiev): Donor Conference on the international assistance to the formerly deported peoples of Crimea, chaired by the HCNM.

25 June (Vienna): Statements by Ms. Mary Robinson, High Commissioner on Human Rights, and Mr. Søren Jessen-Petersen, Assistant United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the meeting of the PC.

23 June (Vienna): Meeting of OSCE HoMs with representatives of UNHCR, UNDP, International Organization for Migration and CoE to discuss the relationship between the OSCE Missions and IOs.

23 June (Vienna): Meeting of the Secretary General with Mr. Anne-Willem Bijleveld, Director for Europe, UNHCR.

8-9 June (Vienna): Visit of a delegation from the EU Commission, headed by Director Angel Viñas, to the OSCE Secretariat in Vienna in order to discuss pragmatic co-operation in various geographic areas, and the possibility of the EC support for specific project proposals submitted by OSCE Missions.

5 June (The Hague): Seminar on the relationship between the OSCE and the Council of Europe.

4 June (Vienna): Address to the Permanent Council by Mr. Cornelio Sommaruga, President of the ICRC.

2-5 June 1998 (Prague): Economic Forum meeting with the participation of international economic organizations and financial institutions.

25-28 May (Warsaw): Human Dimension Seminar on "The Ombudsman and National Human Rights Institutions" with participation of IOs specializing in the relevant field.

7 May (Vienna): Address to the Permanent Council by Ambassador Liviu Bota, Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General in Georgia.

5 May (Vienna): Meeting of the Secretary General with Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala, UNUSG for Disarmament Affairs, to discuss complementarity of regional and OSCE-wide measures, regional approaches to arms control and working group progress.

29 April (Vienna): Informal Permanent Council meeting on follow-up to the HD Seminar on the "Promotion of Women's Participation in Society" with the participation of, *inter alia*, UNDP, UNDCP and CoE.

17-18 April (Sarajevo): Participation of Chairman-in-Office representatives in the UniDem Seminar on "New trends in Electoral Law in a Pan-European Context" organized by Venice Commission (Council of Europe).

3 April (Strasbourg): Tripartite (OSCE, CoE and United Nations with additional participation of WEU) target oriented meeting on pragmatic ways of co-ordinating action in Albania.

30 March (Vienna): Visit of the Chairman of the CoE's Rapporteur Group on relations between the CoE and the OSCE, Ambassador Evgenyi Prokhorov to discuss ways to enhance co-ordination of activities and avoid unnecessary duplication.

24 March (Geneva): Secretary General's visit to Geneva-based organizations and meetings with Executive Secretary of the UN ECE, Mr. Yves Berthelot, the President of the ICRC, Mr. Cornelio Sommaruga, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Ms. Sadako Ogata, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ms. Mary Robinson.

12-14 March (Noordwijk, the Netherlands): Participation of the OSCE representatives in a brainstorming session on the relationship between the OSCE and the Council of Europe.

12 March (London): "2+2" Meeting between the OSCE and the CoE with participation of Chairmen-in-Office and Secretaries General.

3 February (Strasbourg): Address by the Secretary General of the OSCE to the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers at the level of Deputies.

23 January (Geneva): Seventh High level Tripartite Meeting (OSCE, CoE, Geneva-based United Nations organizations) with additional participation of ICRC.

LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION
TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF POLAND,
CHAIRMAN OF THE SEVENTH MINISTERIAL COUNCIL OF THE OSCE

Your Excellency,

In my capacity as Chairman of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC), I have the honour to inform you of the activities of the FSC during 1998 pursuant to the Lisbon Document (Chapters III and IV).

- Regarding the Lisbon decision to expand agreed measures and develop new ones, as announced at Copenhagen last year, the FSC launched a review of the Vienna Document 1994. The work has provided the opportunity for tabling and discussing a substantial number of proposals aimed at enhancing transparency, predictability and co-operation in the light of new security risks and challenges, including its regional dimension. Encouraging progress has been made on many of the proposals, but, owing to the scope and complexity of some of these more time will be needed to complete this work. The FSC's objective is to conclude this work by the time of the next OSCE Summit in 1999.
- Implementing an initiative of the Russian Federation, the FSC held a highly successful "Seminar on Defence Policies and Military Doctrines," from 26-28 January 1998. This seminar was attended by over 350 representatives from the Armed Forces of the OSCE participating States, including over 30 Chiefs of Staff. The Seminar highlighted the successful development of military co-operation throughout the OSCE area. Useful ideas were shared on restructuring and adapting armed forces to meet the security environment anticipated for the twenty-first century, the use of armed forces in crisis management and peacekeeping, and ways to enhance transparency in the development of defence policy and military doctrine.
- In accordance with the Lisbon decision to address regional measures on an informal and open-ended basis, the FSC had a detailed exchange of information on regional measures currently agreed between various participating States. The Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), at the request of the FSC, compiled a useful compendium of the statements made and the agreements shared. This compendium reflects the extent of the exchange and provides a useful basis for a continued dialogue on regional security in the FSC.
- Following up on the Lisbon decision to enhance implementation of agreed measures, and particularly the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security, the FSC approved a questionnaire on implementation of the Code that participating States will answer on an annual basis. The first exchange of information under this agreement will take place on 15 April 1999. The CPC will maintain a record of this information, and a special session of the appropriate FSC Working Group will discuss the information provided.
- Consistent with the OSCE Framework for Arms Control agreed at the Lisbon Summit, the FSC was kept regularly informed of the status of the implementation of Articles II and IV and of the negotiations for a mandate for an agreement under Article V of Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia

and Herzegovina. The Forum has also been regularly informed on the progress of negotiations and other developments in the Joint Consultative Group.

Your Excellency, you might deem it useful to reflect these developments in the appropriate documents of the Seventh Ministerial Council of the OSCE.

LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CONSULTATIVE GROUP
TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF POLAND,
CHAIRMAN OF THE SEVENTH MINISTERIAL COUNCIL OF THE OSCE

Excellency,

In my capacity as Chairman of the Joint Consultative Group (JCG), I have the honour to inform you about the Group's activities on the adaptation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) in accordance with the document agreed at Lisbon in December 1996, on the one hand, and the operation and implementation of the Treaty on the other.

1. Adaptation

Since the July 1997 Agreement on Certain Basic Elements for Treaty Adaptation, negotiations have focused on three general areas:

- The adapted system of limitations and related flexibilities, based on national and territorial ceilings;
- The maintenance and reconciliation of the substance of Article V as modified by the Final Document of the First CFE Treaty Review Conference; and
- Issues related to other aspects of the Treaty, principally Information Exchange and Verification.

The transition from a system of limitations on the permitted equipment holdings of two groups of States Parties to a set of national and nationally based territorial ceilings creates the need for new definitions and mechanisms. The new mechanisms will ensure that the Treaty retains its role as our primary instrument of limitation, restraint and transparency on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. States Parties agreed on most of the key principles and operative elements in this area, but more work remains to be done on specific aspects, the air component being one of those.

Because this new system of limitations will be more constraining than the zonal structure of the current Treaty, and in order to ensure the Treaty retains its stabilizing character, the States Parties have agreed that mechanisms should be established to allow States to adjust ceilings, to transit equipment and to exceed territorial ceilings on a temporary basis with the explicit consent of the host State. Details of these procedures, including the level of equipment that will be permitted in excess of territorial ceilings, are a main subject of discussion, based on specific proposals.

There are also detailed proposals under consideration for increasing stability and predictability in regions of particular concern in the area of application.

With regard to the maintenance and reconciliation of the substance of Article V as modified by the Final Document of the First CFE Treaty Review Conference, progress has been made towards developing a number of basic principles concerning:

- the abolition of all elements referring to the group structure in the Article V area;
- restraint in setting Territorial Ceilings;

- the use of Temporary Deployment provisions; and
- restrictions on the possibility of revising Territorial Ceilings upwards.

However, more work remains to be done in assessing the numerical implications of the maintenance and reconciliation of the substance of Article V, taking into account the debate on the basic principles mentioned above.

Extensive proposals are under discussion pursuant to our shared commitment to increase military transparency and predictability through enhanced verification and information exchange. While the Treaty's existing, highly successful verification and information provisions are the basis for this discussion, in keeping with the July 1997 basic elements agreement, the States Parties have undertaken to tailor information and verification provisions to the more complex structure of the adapted Treaty, with a view to attaining their common goal of greater openness in the CFE area and inspiring full confidence in their ability to verify compliance with adapted Treaty provisions.

The detailed proposals now under discussion in all areas represent an effort by the 30 States Parties to approach adaptation in a balanced and comprehensive way. Negotiations are continuing in a spirit of frankness and good co-operation, taking into account the interests of all States Parties. It is my understanding that the 30 States Parties share a common commitment to achieve decisive progress and begin drafting as soon as possible with a view to completing adaptation of the CFE Treaty by the time of the OSCE Summit in 1999.

2. Operation and implementation issues

Even as the JCG focuses on the challenges of adapting the CFE Treaty to Europe's new security environment, the 30 States Parties continue their work related to the operation and implementation of the current Treaty. The States Parties remain committed to fulfilment of all obligations under the current Treaty and related agreements until an adapted Treaty enters into force.

The Group on Treaty Operation and Implementation (TOI) has worked on three different issues.

- Some results which should not pass unnoticed can be reported on the question of Treaty-limited conventional armaments and equipment unaccounted for and uncontrolled within the Treaty (UTLE), an issue of importance to the CFE community. The second reconnaissance visit by UK experts to the Republic of Moldova helped to gather precise information on the ground and did produce agreement on many aspects of the necessary arrangements for a UTLE on-site visit. More work remains to be done.
- The multinational expert team, with the United States as lead nation, visiting the Russian capital repair facilities in St. Petersburg and Kuchevskaya delivered a comprehensive and accurate report that will help us resolve the issues of accumulation of equipment in the above facilities.
- The Subworking Group on Protocol on Existing Types (POET) of the JCG has, over the past year, continued its efforts aimed at updating this important Protocol of the Treaty. Very constructive discussions continue on the most difficult elements, concerning the removal and addition of specific items from the POET.

On another front, unfortunately, no progress has been registered to date on the issue of armoured personnel carrier ambulances.

Excellency,

We are mindful that our efforts to resolve all outstanding issues of implementation and adaptation of the CFE Treaty are of great interest to the OSCE, for whose participating States this Treaty is, and will continue to be, an essential element of their common and indivisible security.

Excellency, you might deem it useful to reflect these developments in the Chairman's summary.

REPORT BY THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE
ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLES II AND IV OF ANNEX 1-B OF
THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR
PEACE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

1. Article II, Annex 1-B, General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in Bosnia and Herzegovina
 - (a) Status of Implementation
 - Success of the Review Conference held last February
 - No major discrepancies during inspections
 - Trial inspections of “specified areas” (challenge inspections)
 - Remarkable improvement in the quality of data exchanges and notifications
 - Voluntary limitation of training exercises in 1999 under levels permitted by the Agreement
 - Beginning of visits to weapons manufacturing facilities and approval of a related Protocol for these visits
 - Activation of Military Liaison Missions between the defence staffs of the two entities and agreement on a Memorandum of Understanding between the Chiefs of Defence Staff
 - Improved co-ordination with the Office of the High Representative and SFOR
 - Increase of the number of visits and military contacts between the two Entities
 - Organization of a Seminar on Aerial Observation with a practical demonstration and of a Seminar on Civil-Military Co-operation in case of natural disasters with a view to developing a common doctrine for Bosnia and Herzegovina and field manuals for the Entity Armed Forces. They could be tested during a field exercise involving SFOR, OHR and the OSCE at the end of next May
 - Creation, within the universities of Bosnia and Herzegovina, of a network of independent security experts who are linked to similar institutions in OSCE countries
 - (b) Long-Term Objectives
 - Contribution of the Personal Representative and of the OSCE Head of Mission to the strategic concepts of the OHR, with the definition of long-term objectives and division of labour between the different institutions concurring in the stabilization of Bosnia and Herzegovina
 - Focus of the action of the Personal Representative and of the OSCE Mission/Department for Regional Stabilization on co-operation, integration, support

of the joint institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and on reduction of military, financial and social burdens

(c) 1999 Programme

- Consolidation of the results achieved in implementing the notification and inspection regimes, in particular with training of inspectors at weapons manufacturing facilities
- Seminar on Democratic Control of Security Policy and Armed Forces with three goals
 - Establishment or consolidation of joint institutions, in particular the Standing Committee on Military Matters, and of a law on parliamentary control
 - Beginning of a debate on the concepts to be followed for the common security of Bosnia and Herzegovina and for its preparation for integration into international security systems
 - Establishment of a financial planning and budgeting system that would permit transparency
- Seminar on peacekeeping with the goal to establish a common doctrine and field manuals for the Armed Forces of the two Entities to allow them to participate in international community efforts
- Constitution of a Verification Centre at the State level of Bosnia and Herzegovina (to include providing equipment and training); and preparation of a team of inspectors that will allow Bosnia and Herzegovina to exercise its rights and obligations with regard to arms control agreements
- Consolidation of a network of security institutions and independent experts in the Universities of Bosnia and Herzegovina

2. Article IV, Annex 1-B, General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Sub-Regional Arms Control

(a) Status of Implementation

- Consolidation of notification and inspection regimes
- Assistance to the Parties for inspections
- Destruction of excess weapons (250 after the completion of the reduction period)
- Success of the Review Conference (June 1998)

(b) Long-Term Objectives

- Reduction of the exemptions from the Dayton Ceilings with a view to reducing weapons and readiness
- Assistance to the Parties in assuming the chairmanship of the Subregional Consultative Commission

(c) 1999 Programme

- Monitoring of holdings of armaments
- Standing Operating Procedures for the Chairmanship of the Subregional Consultative Commission
- Homogenization of the software of the Verification Centres
- Training in and conduct of inspections at undeclared sites (challenge inspections)
- Workshop to homogenize notifications of relevant data and of conduct of inspections

REPORT BY THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE
FOR NEGOTIATIONS UNDER ARTICLE V OF ANNEX 1-B OF
THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR
PEACE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The Special Representative appointed during the Meeting of the Ministerial Council in December 1997 in Copenhagen started consultations on a mandate with a view to presenting initial results by summer 1998 (MC(6).DEC/2).

Albania, Germany, the United States of America, Austria, Bulgaria, Spain, France, the United Kingdom, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Netherlands, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovenia and Turkey have expressed their wish to participate in these negotiations together with the original signatories of the Dayton/Paris peace accords.

Consultations were held during the spring, with visits to capitals. A keen interest in the Article V process was evident, together with a wish to promote security and greater stability, where it is lacking, in south-eastern Europe.

Several versions of the mandate for negotiations were proposed, incorporating amendments from the prospective participating States. Despite some remaining difficulties, a consensus has been reached on important issues: the aim and objectives of the negotiations; the participation of 20 countries despite having very different perspectives derived from, for example, their geographical positions relative to the region or their existing arms control obligations; equal rights and obligations for all participating States; and no additional obligations for countries already implementing existing arms control regimes, such as Article IV or the CFE Treaty. With the final differences resolved and a consensus reached in November 1998, the negotiations will start in January 1999.

Despite the challenge and distraction of the Kosovo problem, strong interest in the Article V process has been sustained. Article V is the first attempt at a regional arms control or confidence-building regime within the OSCE. If successful, it will make a significant contribution to peace and stability in Europe and will produce a manifest endorsement of the concept of the indivisibility of security.