

## Annex



*Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe*  
*Lisbon, 1996*

## Lisbon Document 1996

### *Table of Contents*

I. Lisbon Document 1996	
Lisbon Summit Declaration	420
Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-First Century	426
II. Annexes	
Annex 1: Statement of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office	430
Annex 2: Statement of the Delegation of Armenia	430
III. A Framework for Arms Control (FSC.DEC/8/96)	431
IV. Development of the Agenda of the Forum for Security Co-operation	437
Appendix:	
Document Adopted by the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe on the Scope and Parameters of the Process Commissioned in Paragraph 19 of the Final Document of the First CFE Treaty Review Conference	442

## I. Lisbon Document 1996

### Lisbon Summit Declaration

1. We, the Heads of State or Government of the participating States of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, have met in Lisbon to assess the situation in the OSCE region and to establish a co-operative foundation for our common security. As we approach the new century, it is more important than ever that we build together a peaceful OSCE region where all our nations and individuals feel secure.

2. We today adopt the Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the twenty-first century to strengthen security and stability throughout the OSCE region. We welcome the historic decision of OSCE participating States signatory to the CFE Treaty to begin negotiations in early 1997 with a view towards adapting the Treaty to the changing security environment in Europe. We intend to realize our full potential for consolidating peace and prosperity in the entire OSCE region, as demonstrated by our combined efforts - through the OSCE and other relevant institutions - to forge a sustainable peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

3. We reaffirm the OSCE principles as set forth in the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE commitments. We believe that observance of all these principles and implementation of all commitments need to be improved and constantly reviewed. We recognize that serious risks and challenges, such as those to our security and sovereignty, continue to be of major concern. We are committed to address them.

4. Respect for human rights remains fundamental to our concept of democracy and to the democratization process enshrined in the Charter of Paris. We are determined to consolidate the democratic gains of the changes that have occurred since 1989 and peacefully manage their further development in the OSCE region. We will co-operate in strengthening democratic institutions.

5. The OSCE has a key role to play in fostering security and stability in all their dimensions. We decide to continue our efforts to further enhance its efficiency as a primary instrument for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation capabilities. We ask the Chairman-in-Office to report on progress achieved to the 1997 Ministerial Council.

6. The Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the twenty-first century is a comprehensive expression

of our endeavour to strengthen security and stability in the OSCE region; as such, it complements the mutually reinforcing efforts of other European and transatlantic institutions and organizations in this field.

7. Arms control constitutes an important element of our common security. The CFE Treaty, in particular, is and will remain key to our security and stability. The Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC), the work of which is also important to our security, has adopted two decisions defining new directions for further work, "A Framework for Arms Control" and "Development of the Agenda of the Forum for Security Co-operation". As an example of co-operative security, the Open Skies Treaty, covering the territory from Vancouver to Vladivostok, aims at increased transparency among all Parties. Recalling the Budapest Decision of 1994, we once again strongly emphasize the significance of the entry into force and implementation of this Treaty. In addition, ending illegal arms supplies, in particular to zones of conflict, would make a major contribution to not only regional, but also global security.

8. We welcome the fulfilment by Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Belarus of their commitment to remove from their territory all nuclear warheads. This is an historic contribution to reducing the nuclear threat and to the creation of a common security space in Europe.

9. The OSCE's comprehensive approach to security requires improvement in the implementation of all commitments in the human dimension, in particular with respect to human rights and fundamental freedoms. 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. Among the acute problems within the human dimension, the continuing, 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, continue to endanger stability in the OSCE region. We are committed to continuing to address these problems.

10. Against the background of recent refugee tragedies in the OSCE region and taking into account the issue of forced migration, we again condemn and pledge to refrain from any policy, of 'ethnic cleansing' or mass expulsion. Our States will facilitate the return, in safety and in dignity, of refugees and internally displaced persons, according to international standards. Their reintegration into their places of origin must be pursued without discrimination. We commend the work of the ODIHR Migration Advisor and express support for his continuing activities to follow up on the Programme of Action agreed at the May 1996 Regional Conference to address the problems of refugees, displaced persons, other forms of involuntary displacement and returnees in the relevant States.

11. Freedom of the press and media are among the basic prerequisites for truly democratic and civil societies. In the Helsinki Final Act, we have pledged ourselves to respect this principle. There is a need to strengthen the implementation of OSCE commitments in the field of the media, taking into account, as appropriate, the work of other international organizations. We therefore task the Permanent Council to consider ways to increase the focus on implementation of OSCE commitments in the field of the media, as well as to elaborate a mandate for the appointment of an OSCE representative on freedom of the media to be submitted not later than to the 1997 Ministerial Council.

12. The same comprehensive approach to security requires continued efforts in the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic dimension and an adequate development of OSCE activities dealing with security-related economic, social and environmental issues. 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. With this aim, the OSCE should further enhance its ties to mutually-reinforcing international economic and financial institutions, including regular consultations at appropriate levels aimed at improving the ability to identify and assess at an early stage the security relevance of economic, social and environmental developments. Interaction with regional, subregional and transborder co-operative initiatives in the economic and environmental field should be enhanced, as they contribute to the promotion of good-neighbourly relations and security. We therefore task the Permanent Council to review the role of the OSCE Secretariat in the economic dimension, and to elaborate a mandate for a co-ordinator within the OSCE Secretariat on OSCE economic and environmental activities, to be submitted not later than the 1997 Ministerial Council.

13. We pay tribute to the achievements of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina in helping to implement the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Pragmatic co-operation with international institutions and IFOR, as well as the role of the High Representative, have contributed greatly to this success, thus demonstrating in a tangible way the kinds of co-operative undertakings on which security can be built through the action of mutually reinforcing institutions.

14. We welcome the agreement by the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the establishment of the Council of Ministers, which represents an important step in forming fully effective joint institutions. Reaffirming the need for the full implementation of the Peace Agreement, we welcome the guiding principles agreed at the Meeting of the Ministerial Steering Board and the

Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Paris on 14 November 1996, and the OSCE decision to extend its Mission's mandate to Bosnia and Herzegovina for 1997, noting its possible prolongation in the framework of the two-year consolidation period. We pledge ourselves to provide all necessary resources, financial and personnel, for the Mission to fulfil its mandate.

15. The OSCE will continue to play an important role in the promotion and consolidation of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina based on OSCE principles and commitments. We confirm that we will supervise the preparation and conduct of elections for the municipal governing authorities in 1997, and welcome the agreement of the Parties to Annex 3 of the Peace Agreement in this regard. We will fully support the Mission's work and its contribution to implementation of the election results. We will assist in democracy building through concrete programmes and be active in human rights promotion and monitoring. We will continue assisting in the implementation of subregional stabilization measures among the Parties to the Peace Agreement.

16. Recalling that the prime responsibility for implementing the Peace Agreement lies with the Parties themselves, we call upon them to co-operate in good faith with the OSCE and other institutions in implementing the civilian aspects of the Peace Agreement. The role of the High Representative will remain of particular importance in this context. We call upon the Parties to co-operate fully with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

17. The Agreement on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Sub-Regional Arms Control Agreement will continue to play an important role in promoting and consolidating military stability in and around Bosnia and Herzegovina. Favourable conditions for full implementation of these Agreements should be fostered. Failure to meet the commitments under these Agreements remains, however, a serious concern. We support the November 1996 reaffirmation in Paris by the Ministerial Steering Board and the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina of the necessity for full implementation and strict avoidance of circumvention of both Agreements. We call upon the Parties to fulfil their commitments through co-operation in good faith. With respect to regional arms control, and depending on satisfactory progress on the implementation of Articles II and IV, efforts undertaken to promote the implementation of Article V of Annex 1-B of the Peace Agreement will continue.

18. The implementation of the Peace Agreement for Bosnia and Herzegovina has opened the way for efforts at the regional and subregional levels aimed at the achievement of durable peace, stability and good neighbourliness in Southeastern Europe. We welcome the development of various initiatives fostering subregional dialogue and co-operation, such as the Stability Process initiated at Royaumont, the Southeastern European Co-operation Initiative,

the Central European Initiative and the comprehensive process of stability, security and co-operation reactivated by the Sofia Declaration of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries of Southeastern Europe. The OSCE could contribute to using fully the potential of the various regional co-operative efforts in a mutually supportive and reinforcing way.

19. We welcome the OSCE's continuing focus on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. We express our expectation that the OSCE Mission of Long Duration to Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina will be able to resume its work as soon as possible. In fulfilling its mandate, such a Mission should actively contribute, among other things, to following developments and fostering dialogue with a view to overcoming the existing difficulties. Other forms of OSCE involvement would also be desirable. They should include efforts to accelerate democratization, promote independent media and ensure free and fair elections. Recalling our previous declarations, we call for the development of a substantial dialogue between the Federal Authorities and the Albanian representatives of Kosovo in order to solve all pending problems there.

20. We reaffirm our utmost support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia within its internationally recognized borders. We condemn the 'ethnic cleansing' resulting in mass destruction and forcible expulsion of predominantly Georgian population in Abkhazia. Destructive acts of separatists, including obstruction of the return of refugees and displaced persons and the decision to hold elections in Abkhazia and in the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, undermine the positive efforts undertaken to promote political settlement of these conflicts. We are convinced that the international community, in particular the United Nations and the OSCE with participation of the Russian Federation as a facilitator, should continue to contribute actively to the search for a peaceful settlement.

21. We note that some progress has been made towards a political settlement in Moldova. Real political will is needed now to overcome the remaining difficulties in order to achieve a solution based on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova. We call on all sides to increase their efforts to that end. Recalling the Budapest Summit Decision, we reiterate our concern over the lack of progress in bringing into force and implementing the Moldo-Russian Agreement of 21 October 1994 on the withdrawal of Russian troops. We expect an early, orderly and complete withdrawal of the Russian troops. In fulfilment of the mandate of the Mission and other relevant OSCE decisions, we confirm the commitment of the OSCE, including through its Mission, to follow closely the implementation of this process, as well as to assist in achieving a settlement in the eastern part of Moldova, in close co-operation with the Russian and Ukrainian mediators. The Chairman-in-Office will report on progress achieved to the next meeting of the Ministerial Council.



22. We welcome the recent steps towards a peaceful settlement in Chechnya, Russian Federation. We recognize the valuable role played by the OSCE Assistance Group in facilitating dialogue towards political resolution of the crisis. We believe that the Assistance Group should continue to play its role in the future, in particular with a view towards a lasting peaceful settlement, monitoring human rights and supporting humanitarian organizations.

23. We emphasize the importance of the Central Asian States in the OSCE. We are committed to increasing OSCE efforts aimed at developing democratic structures and the rule of law, maintaining stability and preventing conflicts in this area.

24. 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.

25. The next Ministerial Council will take place in Copenhagen in December 1997.

26. We take note of the invitation by Turkey to host the next Summit in Istanbul.

27. Poland will exercise the function of Chairman-in-Office in 1998.

## Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-First Century

1. We, the Heads of State or Government of the States participating in the OSCE and meeting in Lisbon, believe that history has offered us an unprecedented opportunity. Freedom, democracy and co-operation among our nations and peoples are now the foundation for our common security. We are determined to learn from the tragedies of the past and to translate our vision of a co-operative future into reality by creating a common security space free of dividing lines in which all States are equal partners.

2. We face serious challenges, but we face them together. They concern the security and sovereignty of States as well as the stability of our societies. 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, drug and arms trafficking, uncontrolled migration and environmental damage are of increasing concern to the entire OSCE community.

3. Drawing strength from our diversity, we shall meet these challenges together, through the OSCE and in partnership with other international organizations. Our approach is one of co-operative security based on democracy, respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law, market economy and social justice. It excludes any quest for domination. It implies mutual confidence and the peaceful settlement of disputes,

4. The OSCE plays a central role in achieving our goal of a common security space. Its fundamental elements - the comprehensiveness and indivisibility of security and the allegiance to shared values, commitments and norms of behaviour - inspire our vision of empowering governments and individuals to build a better and more secure future.

5. We recognize that, within the OSCE, States are accountable to their citizens and responsible to each other for their implementation of OSCE commitments.

6. We jointly commit ourselves:

- 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 CSCE/OSCE documents;

- to consult promptly - in conformity with our OSCE responsibilities and making full use of the OSCE's procedures and instruments - with a participating State whose security is threatened and to consider jointly actions that may have to be undertaken in defence of our common values;
- not to support participating States that threaten or use force in violation of international law against the territorial integrity or political independence of any participating State;
- to attach importance to security concerns of all participating States irrespective of whether they belong to military structures or arrangements.

7. We reaffirm the inherent right of each and every participating State to be free to choose or change its security arrangements, including treaties of alliance, as they evolve. Each participating State will respect the rights of all others in this regard. They will not strengthen their security at the expense of the security of other States. Within the OSCE, no State, organization or grouping can have any superior responsibility for maintaining peace and stability in the OSCE region, or regard any part of the OSCE region as its sphere of influence.

8. We shall ensure that the presence of foreign troops on the territory of a participating State is in conformity with international law, the freely expressed consent of the host State, or a relevant decision of the United Nations Security Council.

9. We are committed to transparency in our actions and in our relations with one another. All our States participating in security arrangements will take into consideration that such arrangements should be of a public nature, predictable and open, and should correspond to the needs of individual and collective security. These arrangements must not infringe upon the sovereign rights of other States and will take into account their legitimate security concerns.

We may use the OSCE as a repository for declarations and agreements in regard to our security arrangements.

10. Based on these foundations, our task- now is to enhance our co-operation for the future. To this end:

- We encourage bilateral or regional initiatives aimed at developing relations of good neighbourliness and co-operation. In this context, the OSCE could explore a menu of confidence- and security-building measures in support of regional security processes. We shall continue to follow the implementation of the Pact on Stability in Europe. Regional round tables can be a useful means of preventive diplomacy.

- As an important contribution to security we reaffirm our determination to fully respect and implement all our commitments relating to the rights of persons belonging to national minorities. We reaffirm our will to co-operate fully with the High Commissioner on National Minorities. We are ready to respond to a request by any participating State seeking solutions to minority issues on its territory.
- We value our co-operation with regions adjacent to the OSCE region, giving particular attention to the Mediterranean area.
- We commit ourselves to the continuation of the arms control process as a central security issue in the OSCE region.
- The further strengthening of stability through conventional arms control will be decisive for future European security. We reaffirm the importance of the CFE Treaty and welcome the decision of the CFE States Parties to adapt it to a changing security environment in Europe so as to contribute to common and indivisible security. We welcome the decisions on the "Framework for Arms Control" and on the "Development of the Agenda of the Forum for Security Co-operation" adopted by the Forum for Security Co-operation. We are determined to make further efforts in this Forum in order to jointly address common security concerns of participating States and to pursue the OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative concept of indivisible security.
- In this context, we reaffirm that we shall maintain only such military capabilities as are commensurate with individual or collective legitimate security needs, taking into account rights and obligations under international law. We shall determine our military capabilities on the basis of national democratic procedures, in a transparent manner, bearing in mind the legitimate security concerns of other States as well as the need to contribute to international security and stability.
- We reaffirm that European security requires the widest co-operation and co-ordination among participating States and European and transatlantic organizations. The OSCE is the inclusive and comprehensive organization for consultation, decision-making and co-operation in its region and a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. As such it is particularly well suited as a forum to enhance co-operation and complementarity among such organizations and institutions. The OSCE will act in partnership with them, in order to respond effectively to threats and challenges in its area.
- In exceptional circumstances the participating States may jointly decide to refer a matter to the United Nations Security Council on behalf of the OSCE whenever, in their judgement, action by the Security Council may

be required under the relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

- The OSCE will strengthen co-operation with other security organizations which are transparent and predictable in their actions, whose members individually and collectively adhere to OSCE principles and commitments, and whose membership is based on open and voluntary commitments.

11. Our work on the Security Model is well under way and will actively continue. We instruct our representatives to work energetically on the Security Model and invite the Chairman-in-Office to report to the next Ministerial Council in Copenhagen. The agenda for their work will include the following:

- continuing review of the OSCE principles and implementation of commitments to ensure progress towards the goals of the OSCE and towards the work outlined in this agenda;
- enhancing instruments of joint co-operative action within the OSCE framework in the event of non-compliance with the OSCE commitments by a participating State;
- defining in a Platform for Co-operative Security modalities for co-operation between the OSCE and other security organizations as set out above;
- based on the experience of OSCE instruments for preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention, 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;
- enhancing co-operation among participating States to develop further the concepts and principles included in this Declaration and to improve our ability to meet specific risks and challenges to security;
- recommending any new commitments, structures or arrangements within the OSCE framework which would reinforce security and stability in Europe.

Drawing on this work, remaining committed to the Helsinki Final Act and recalling the Charter of Paris, we will consider developing a Charter on European Security which can serve the needs of our peoples in the new century.

12. Our goal is to transform our search for greater security into a mutual effort to achieve the aspirations and improve the lives of all our citizens. This quest, grounded in pragmatic achievements as well as ideals, will draw on the flexible and dynamic nature of the OSCE and its central role in ensuring -security and stability.

## II. Annexes

### Annex 1: Statement of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office

You all know that no progress has been achieved in the last two years to resolve the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and the issue of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan. I regret that the efforts of the Co-Chairmen of the Minsk Conference to reconcile the views of the parties on the principles for a settlement have been unsuccessful.

Three principles which should form part of the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict were recommended by the Co-Chairmen of the Minsk Group. These principles are supported by all member States of the Minsk Group. They are:

- territorial integrity of the Republic of Armenia and the Azerbaijan Republic;
- legal status of Nagorno-Karabakh defined in an agreement based on self-determination which confers on Nagorno-Karabakh the highest degree of self-rule within Azerbaijan;
- guaranteed security for Nagorno-Karabakh and its whole population, including mutual obligations to ensure compliance by all the Parties with the provisions of the settlement.

I regret that one participating State could not accept this. These principles have the support of all other participating States.

This statement will be included in the Lisbon Summit documents.

### Annex 2: Statement of the Delegation of Armenia

With regard to the statement by the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, the Delegation of Armenia wishes to express its concern over the following issues:

1. The statement does not reflect either the spirit or the letter of the Minsk Group's mandate as established by the Budapest Summit 1994, which proposed negotiations with a view to reaching a political agreement. The problem of status has been a subject of discussion in direct negotiations which have yet to be concluded.

2. The statement predetermines the status of Nagorno-Karabakh, contradicting the decision of the OSCE Ministerial Council of 1992, which referred this issue to the competence of the OSCE Minsk Conference, to be convened after the conclusion of a political agreement.
3. The Armenian side is convinced that a solution of the problem can be found on the basis of international law and the principles laid down in the Helsinki Final Act, above all on the basis of the principle of self-determination.
4. In the interests of reaching a compromise solution, the Armenian side is prepared to continue with the most intensive negotiations, both within the Minsk Group and on the basis of direct contacts co-ordinated by the Co-Chairmen of that Group.

I request that this statement be annexed to the Lisbon Summit Declaration.

### III. A Framework for Arms Control

(FSC.DEC/8/96)

#### *I. Introduction*

Arms control, including disarmament and confidence- and security-building, is 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 is essential for enhancing military and political stability within the OSCE area. The positive trends of co-operation, transparency and predictability need to be strengthened.

2. Building on existing arms control measures, the OSCE will seek to develop new ways to deal with security concerns affecting all States in the OSCE area. Such security concerns include inter- or intra-State tensions and conflicts which might spread to affect the security of other States. The goal should be to develop a concept and structure that will support a range of arms control efforts, including on regional matters. At all times it will be important to ensure complementarity between OSCE-wide and regional approaches. Regional arms control efforts should be based *inter alia* on specific military security issues.
3. In order to provide this conceptual and structural coherence to the OSCE's efforts, the participating States have decided to establish a Framework for Arms Control, designed to create a web of interlocking and mutually reinforcing arms control obligations and commitments. The Framework

will link current and future arms control efforts into a comprehensive structure. It will serve as a guide for future arms control negotiations amongst the participating States, and as a basis for the establishment of a flexible agenda for future work on arms control. The Framework will be an important contribution to wider OSCE efforts in the security field, and will complement ongoing work in the OSCE on a security model for the twenty-first century.

4. The basis for such a web already exists. 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 the military forces and military activities of all OSCE participating States. The Code of Conduct has defined important norms for politico-military aspects of security. These existing obligations and commitments lie at the heart of the OSCE's concept of co-operative security.

The Treaty on Open Skies, which should enter into force as soon as possible, can make a major contribution to transparency and openness.

The arms control process under OSCE auspices initiated by the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina is an important part of the OSCE's efforts to strengthen security and stability.

In addition to continued emphasis on the full implementation and appropriate further development of existing agreements, new negotiations and efforts are needed to complement their contribution in order to provide effective responses to the military challenges to the security of the OSCE participating States.

5. The lessons and achievements of past efforts, as well as the purposes, methods and negotiating principles set out in this document together form the basis for addressing the challenges and risks to military security in the OSCE area. Thus, subsequent negotiations and resulting agreements will be related conceptually to existing agreements within the Framework. The Forum for Security Co-operation has a key role to play in the way in which the OSCE links the many separate endeavours that individually and collectively contribute to the security and well-being of all participating States.



6. The purpose of the Framework is:

- to contribute to the further development of the OSCE area as an indivisible common security space by, *inter alia*, stimulating the elaboration of further arms control measures;
- to provide a basis for strengthening security and stability through tangible steps aimed at enhancing the security partnership among OSCE participating States;
- to enable OSCE participating States to deal with specific security problems in appropriate ways, not in isolation but as part of an overall OSCE undertaking to which all are committed;
- to create a web of interlocking and mutually reinforcing arms control obligations and commitments that will give expression to the principle that security is indivisible for all OSCE participating States;
- to provide structural coherence to the interrelationship between existing and future agreements;
- to provide a basis for the establishment of a flexible agenda for future arms control in the OSCE.

*II. Challenges and Risks*

7. Challenges and risks in the field of military security still exist in the OSCE area and others may arise in the future. The Framework will help to promote co-operative responses to challenges and risks that may be dealt with through arms control measures. In doing so, the following issues, *inter alia*, should be addressed:

- military imbalances that may contribute to instabilities;
- inter-State tensions and conflicts, in particular in border areas, that affect military security;
- internal disputes with the potential to lead to military tensions or conflicts between States;
- enhancing transparency and predictability as regards the military intentions of States;
- helping to ensure democratic political control and guidance of military, paramilitary and security forces by constitutionally established authorities and the rule of law;

- ensuring that the evolution or establishment of multinational military and political organizations is fully compatible with the OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative concept of security, and is also fully consistent with arms control goals and objectives;
- ensuring that no participating State, organization or grouping strengthens its security at the expense of the security of others, or regards any part of the OSCE area as a particular sphere of influence;
- ensuring that the presence of foreign troops on the territory of a participating State is in conformity with international law, the freely expressed consent of the host State, or a relevant decision of the United Nations Security Council;
- ensuring full implementation of arms control agreements at all times, including times of crisis;
- ensuring through a process of regular review undertaken in the spirit of co-operative security, that arms control agreements continue to respond to security needs in the OSCE area;
- ensuring full co-operation, including co-operation in the implementation of existing commitments, in combating terrorism in all its forms and practices.

### *III. Negotiating Principles*

8. Interlocking and mutually reinforcing arms control agreements are the logical consequence of the principle of the indivisibility of security. Accordingly, both negotiation of and implementation within the OSCE area of regional or other agreements not binding on all OSCE participating States are a matter of direct interest to all participating States. The OSCE participating States will continue efforts to build confidence and stability through freely negotiated arms control agreements. Arms control regimes will take into account the specific characteristics of the armed forces of individual participating States as well as already agreed commitments and obligations. Drawing on past experience, the OSCE participating States have developed the following principles, to serve as a guide for future negotiations. The applicability of each of these principles will depend on the particular security needs being addressed;

- *Sufficiency.* Arms control regimes should contain measures designed to ensure that each participating State will maintain only such military capabilities as are commensurate with legitimate individual or collective se-

curity needs, and will not attempt to impose military domination over any other participating State.

- *Transparency through information exchange.* A key element of an effective arms control regime is provision for complete, accurate and timely exchange of relevant information, including the size, structure, location and military doctrine of military forces as well as their activities.
- *Verification.* The measures adopted should be combined, as appropriate, with verification that is commensurate with their substance and significance. This should include verification sufficiently intrusive to permit an assessment of information exchanged and of the implementation of agreed measures subject to verification, thereby enhancing confidence.
- *Limitations on forces.* Limitations and, where necessary, reductions are an important element in the continuing search for security and stability at lower levels of forces. Other constraining provisions on armed forces and security-building measures continue to be significant elements in the quest for stability.

#### *IV. Goals and Methods for the further Developments of Arms Control*

9. Among the goals of arms control and the methods to help strengthen stability and security and increase transparency, co-operation and confidence within the OSCE area should be the following:

- to strengthen the concept of the indivisibility of security;
- to improve existing OSCE-wide measures, based on a continuing evaluation of their effectiveness, and to develop as appropriate new ones, to deal with future and continuing security challenges;
- to move the discussion of regional security issues to a more practical and concrete plane, in order to devise measures aimed at reducing regional instability and military imbalances among OSCE participating States;
- to devise arms control measures for stabilizing specific crisis situations, including by making appropriate use of any relevant existing measures;
- to examine, as appropriate, the issue of limitations on armed forces and constraints on their activities;
- to take due account, in elaborating arms control measures, of the legitimate security interests of each participating State, irrespective of whether it belongs to a politico-military alliance;

- to develop transparency, consultation and co-operation in the evolution or establishment of multinational military and political organizations, recognizing, in this context the inherent right of each participating State to choose or change its own security arrangements, including treaties of alliance;
- to ensure greater transparency by providing information to all participating States on the implementation within the OSCE area of regional or other agreements not binding on all OSCE participating States, as agreed by the signatories of such agreements,
- to improve existing verification provisions and to develop new ones, as necessary.

10. The participating States recognize that the full implementation, at all times, of the obligations and commitments they have agreed to makes an indispensable contribution to the achievement of these goals. They intend to continue to follow that implementation closely on a regular basis, and to seek more effective methods of reviewing implementation, including by making the best use of existing expertise and resources.

#### *V. Building a Web of Arms Control Agreements*

11. The participating States have undertaken a variety of obligations and commitments in the field of 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. The agreements listed in the Annex to this document constitute a basis for a web of interlocking and mutually-reinforcing agreements. The full implementation of the agreements listed is essential for building the collective and individual security of the participating States, irrespective of whether or not they are a party or signatory to these agreements.

12. Building on the results achieved, future work on arms control will address emerging and new challenges as well as further developing transparency, openness and co-operation in the military field. Future arms control agreements may be negotiated separately but would be integral to the web.

#### *Annex to "A Framework for Arms Control"*

- Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
- Treaty on Open Skies

- Concluding Act of the Negotiation on Personnel Strength of Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
- Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations
- Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers
- Global Exchange of Military Information
- Vienna Document 1994
- Code of Conduct
- Principles Governing Non-Proliferation

#### IV. Development of the Agenda of the Forum for Security Co-operation

(FSC.DEC/9/96)

The participating States of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE):

- recalling their decision to establish the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) to strengthen security and stability within the OSCE community of States, as laid down in Chapter V of the Helsinki Summit Declaration of 10 July 1992,
- having reviewed and assessed the results achieved in the negotiations within the FSC, in particular under the Programme for Immediate Action as agreed upon in Helsinki, and the further tasks set in Chapter V of the Budapest Summit Declaration of 6 December 1994,
- concluding that a new work programme is required for the FSC,
- building on the document entitled "A Framework for Arms Control",
- recalling their commitment to use this Framework as a basis for an agenda for arms control, with a view to strengthening the network of security commitments that the participating States undertake to each other, and
- taking account of existing agreements and of the particular security needs and the specific characteristics of the armed forces of individual participating States,

have decided that the FSC should, as a matter of priority, address the following issues:

### *I. Implementation of Agreed Arms Control Measures*

The participating States agree to continue to pursue full implementation, in both letter and spirit, of all existing arms control measures and confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) agreed upon by the OSCE, with a view to further strengthening confidence, security and stability in the OSCE area. Specific attention will be given to the implementation of the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security, including consideration of a follow-up conference. The FSC will continue its assessment of the implementation of agreed measures by using the established procedures.

The FSC will consider the possible provision of assistance requested by participating States with regard to implementation. This will draw upon the resources volunteered by the participating States and on the existing resources and experience of the Conflict Prevention Centre.

### *II. Regional Measures*

Recognizing the challenges presented as well as the opportunities offered by situations in specific regions, the participating States may, within the FSC and on an informal and open-ended basis, address regional issues and explore possibilities for enhanced co-operation. This will be based on the initiative and interest of a participating State (or of States) in the region concerned. The participating States may also address regional issues in direct response to instability within, or threatening to expand into, a region of the OSCE area. In particular, the FSC may look at ways at making more effective use of its decision on "Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations".

Such initiatives may address measures tailored to the region and complementary to OSCE-wide efforts, if such efforts need enhancing in order to meet the specific needs of a region. The measures may be designed to consolidate or increase transparency and predictability, to promote good-neighbourly relations in the military field, or to reduce tension. They will be an integral part of OSCE-wide commitments.

The FSC will support regional agreements which have been or are to be negotiated, either with the direct involvement of the OSCE or under its auspices.

### *III. Developing a Web of Arms Control*

The participating States have undertaken, via the Framework for Arms Control, to establish a web of interlocking and mutually reinforcing agreements.

This may involve exploring ways participating States may develop, through negotiations freely entered into and on the basis of equality of rights, new arrangements to support co-operative approaches and to address security concerns and needs identified in the framework for Arms Control. Such arrangements, which may vary in their substance and geographical scope, being OSCE-wide, regional or bilateral, will be an integral part of the web and will be consistent with each other as well as with the goals and methods set out in the Framework for Arms Control.

In accordance with its mandate, the FSC will develop its security dialogue function. The participating States will make full use of this body for regular and substantial exchanges of information on the work done and the progress made concerning separate arms control negotiations and processes (for example within the Joint Consultative Group). This procedure would allow views and concerns expressed in the FSC to be taken into consideration in the course of such negotiations and processes, bearing in mind the OSCE's comprehensive concept of indivisible security.

### *IV. Enhancing Agreed Measures and Developing New Ones*

The participating States agree to seek ways of strengthening existing arms control agreements and CSBM regimes, in particular the Vienna Document 1994, in order to increase transparency and predictability in their security relations. The FSC will also look at the prospects for promoting co-operative forms of verification and at how best to use CSBMs and other arms control instruments in preventive diplomacy, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

The FSC will consider further efforts to develop Norm- and Standard-Setting Measures (NSSMs), such as the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security, the Guidelines Governing Conventional Arms Transfers and the Principles Governing Non-Proliferation, as well as the possibility of the adoption of new NSSMs.

In conformity with the risks and challenges set out in the Framework for Arms Control, the FSC will study the possible development of new measures. A list of suggestions advanced to date by one or more of the participating States is contained in the Annex.

\*\*\*\*\*

The participating States will consider:

- the introduction of greater efficiency into the methods of the FSC;
- ways of achieving greater cohesion between the FSC and the Permanent Council in complementary fields of activity;
- extending, upon request and within existing resources, the FSC's experience to partner States in the adjacent Mediterranean area; and
- measures for complementing (but not duplicating) the international community's efforts in relation to an effective solution regarding anti-personnel landmines and in relation to the fight against terrorism.

\*\*\*\*\*

The participating States of the OSCE have further decided that the FSC will report at the next meeting of the Ministerial Council on progress made and on which specific items the FSC has decided to take forward within the agenda.

*Annex to "Development of the Agenda of the Forum for Security Co-operation"*

Bearing in mind concerns expressed by certain participating States, the following non-consensual suggestions have been advanced by one or more participating States.

- Extension of CSBMs to naval activities
- Exchange of information on internal security forces
- Measures concerning the stationing of armed forces
- Co-operation in defence conversion
- Measures concerning the deployment of armed forces on foreign territories, including their transborder movements
- Regular seminars on military doctrine (to be held at a high military level)
- An "OSCE White Paper" on defence issues, based on existing OSCE information regimes and drawing on national experiences
- Studying the possibility of the creation of zones in Europe free of nuclear weapons
- Voluntary participation, on a national basis, in verification and information exchange of regional regimes



- Transparency with regard to structural, qualitative and operational aspects of armed forces
- Unilateral declaration of weapons ceilings

Any further suggestions to be made will be in line with the rules and procedures of the FSC.

## Appendix

The following document was brought to the attention of the Summit by the Chairman, Prime Minister of Portugal H.E. Antonio Guterres, at the request of the Prime Minister of Belgium, H.E. Jean-Luc Dehaene, in his capacity as Chairman of the CFE Joint Consultative Group.

*Document Adopted by the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe on the Scope and Parameters of the Process Commissioned in Paragraph 19 of the Final Document of the First CFE Treaty Review Conference*

*1 December 1996*

### *I. Introduction*

1. The States Parties have defined the following scope and parameters for the process commissioned in paragraph 19 of the Final Document of the First CFE Treaty Review Conference.

### *II. Aims and Objectives*

2. The States Parties intend to improve the operation of the Treaty in a changing environment and, through that, the security of each State Party, irrespective of whether it belongs to a politico-military alliance. The character of this process should be such as to permit the Treaty to sustain its key role in the European security architecture, in conditions existing and foreseen.

3. The process should strengthen the Treaty's system of limitations, verification and information exchange. It should promote the Treaty's objectives and enhance its viability and effectiveness as the cornerstone of European security, introducing such new elements and making such adaptations, revisions or adjustments to existing elements as may be agreed to be necessary.

4. The process should preserve and strengthen overall and zonal stability and continue to prevent destabilizing accumulations of forces anywhere within the Treaty's area of application.

5. The process should further develop and consolidate the emerging new co-operative pattern of relationships between States Parties, based on mutual confidence, transparency, stability and predictability. It will aim to promote equally the security of all CFE States Parties. Acting within the context of the

Treaty, States Parties will address new security risks and challenges through binding mechanisms, while taking into account the legitimate security interests of each State Party.

### *III. Principles*

6. The following principles will guide the process:

- arms control obligations, freely entered into, must be fully met;
- the integrity of the Treaty and its associated Documents must be preserved, that is to say a common commitment to the Treaty's objectives, achievements and efficient functioning;
- the results of the process must be internally consistent, coherent and an integrated whole;
- the States Parties will avoid a wholesale renegotiation of the Treaty, adopting specific adaptations for specific purposes;
- the process must be consistent with the OSCE's concept of comprehensive, indivisible and co-operative security, while bearing in mind States Parties' other security arrangements and obligations, their inherent right to choose or change security arrangements, the legitimate security interests of other States Parties, and the fundamental right of each State Party to protect its national security individually;
- the existing Treaty and its associated Documents must remain fully in force and be implemented in good faith until such measures and adaptations as may be decided upon through this process have themselves come into operation;
- the States Parties will maintain, individually or in association with others, only such military capabilities as are commensurate with individual or collective legitimate security needs, taking into account their obligations under international law;
- the process should not result in any adverse effect on the legitimate security interests of any CFE State Party or other OSCE participating State;
- the process should recognize the importance of the CFE Treaty's adaptation for:
  - the broader OSCE security context, in particular the ongoing dialogue in the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC);

- the work on a common and comprehensive security model for the twenty-first century;
- separate regional arms control arrangements and negotiations, both existing and as they occur, will be taken into account.

#### *IV. Scope*

7. To meet the aims and objectives set out in Section II, and committed to the Principles recorded in Section III of this Document, the States Parties will consider and elaborate, as appropriate, specific measures and adaptations to the Treaty.

8. The scope of this process will be consistent with the original CFE mandate, taking account of developments since Treaty signature, and with agreements reached at the First CFE Treaty Review Conference, and will retain:

- all existing categories of Treaty-Limited Equipment (TLE) established by the Treaty and will not result in an increase in total numbers of TLE within the Treaty's area of application;
- all the scope and detail of the information and verification arrangements established by the Treaty;
- the area of application established by the Treaty.

9. Specific aspects of this process will involve, *inter alia*, consideration of the following:

- evolution of the group structure of the Treaty, as well as elaboration of provisions addressing participation of States Parties in the Treaty other than as members of a group;
- the functioning of the Treaty's system of limitations and its individual elements, that is:
  - development of the Treaty's system of maximum levels for holdings, including the possibility to establish a system of national limits for TLE;
  - in this context the development of the redistribution mechanisms in Article VII;
  - the zonal provisions in Article IV of the Treaty, preserving the principle of zonal limitations, so that no destabilizing accumulations of forces should occur;

- the provisions in Article IV of the Treaty limiting aggregate numbers for a group of States Parties, preserving the principle that no destabilizing accumulations of forces should occur;
- the Treaty's provisions in relation to stationing forces;
- Article XIV and related provisions on Verification, the Protocol on Notification and Exchange of Information and the possibility of promoting further co-operation in the spheres of Information Exchange and Verification;
- the Treaty's provisions on designated permanent storage sites (DPSS);
- the possibility of accession to the Treaty by individual States who might request it, and related modalities;
- means to assure the full functioning of the Treaty in cases of crisis and conflict;
- the possibility of incorporating provisions designed to facilitate the involvement and co-operation of States Parties in peacekeeping operations conducted under the mandate of the United Nations or the OSCE;
- the possibility of extending the Treaty's coverage so as to include new, or expanded, categories of conventional armaments and equipment;
- provisions on temporary deployments.

10. Further measures and adaptations, additional to those listed in paragraph 9 above, may be taken under consideration as part of this process as it evolves.

#### *V. Timetable, Modalities and Miscellaneous*

11. The States Parties have decided that:

- in order to permit the next phase of this process to commence promptly in 1997, in accordance with the scope and parameters defined in Sections II-IV above, the Joint Consultative Group (JCG), in Vienna, in parallel with its ongoing tasks, will take responsibility for these negotiations when it resumes work in January 1997;
- they will work in good faith with the aim of completing these negotiations as expeditiously as those conducted under the original Treaty mandate;

- they will consider a report on results achieved at the time of the OSCE Ministerial Meeting in Copenhagen;
- during these negotiations, the Chairman of the JCG should, on a frequent and regular basis, at the FSC inform all other OSCE participating States of the work done and progress made; and that States Parties should exchange views with other OSCE participating States and take into consideration the views expressed by the latter concerning their own security.

12. They also recall that:

- the JCG should, in parallel with these negotiations, intensively continue efforts directed at resolving the implementation issues contained in the Review Conference Final Document, recognizing that such efforts will contribute substantially to the success of the negotiating process;
- the existence of this negotiating process will not prevent the JCG from adopting concurrently additional measures for enhancing the operational functioning of the current Treaty;

#### *VI. Underpinning the Process*

13. Building on the achievements of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, States Parties commit themselves to exercise restraint during the period of negotiations as foreseen in the document in relation to the current postures and capabilities of their conventional armed forces - in particular with respect to their levels of forces and deployments - in the Treaty's area of application, in order to avoid that developments in the security situation in Europe would diminish the security of any State Party. This commitment is without prejudice to the outcome of the negotiations, or to voluntary decisions by the individual States Parties to reduce their force levels or deployments, or to their legitimate security interests.

*Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe*

*The Secretary General*

# Annual Report 1996 on OSCE Activities

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	450
II.	Activities of the OSCE	452
1.	Political Consultation and Negotiations	452
2.	Early Warning, Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management	452
2.1.	OSCE Missions of Long Duration	452
2.1.1.	Mission of Long Duration in Kosovo, Sanjak and Vojvodina	453
2.1.2.	Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje	453
2.1.3.	Mission to Georgia	453
2.1.4.	Mission to Estonia	455
2.1.5.	Mission to Moldova	455
2.1.6.	Mission to Latvia	456
2.1.7.	Mission to Tajikistan	456
2.1.8.	Mission to Sarajevo	457
2.1.9.	Mission to Ukraine	457
2.1.10.	Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina	458
2.1.11.	Mission to Croatia	460
2.2.	Other OSCE Field Activities	461
2.2.1.	OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya	461
2.2.2.	Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on the conflict dealt with by the Minsk Conference	461
2.3.	OSCE Assistance in the Implementation of Bilateral Agreements	462
2.3.1.	The OSCE Representative to the Latvian-Russian Joint Commission on Military Pensioners	462
2.3.2.	The OSCE Representative to the Estonian Government Commission on Military Pensioners	462
2.3.3.	The OSCE Representative to the Joint Committee on the Skrunda Radar Station	462
2.3.4.	Sanctions Co-ordinator and Sanctions Assistance Missions (SAMs)	463
		447

3.	The High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM)	463
3.1.	Croatia	464
3.2.	Estonia	464
3.3.	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	465
3.4.	Hungary	465
3.5.	Kazakhstan	465
3.6.	Kyrgyzstan	465
3.7.	Latvia	466
3.8.	Romania	466
3.9.	Slovakia	466
3.10.	Ukraine	467
4.	The Human Dimension: Activities of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	467
4.1.	Election Monitoring	467
4.2.	Integrating the Human Dimension in the Work of the Permanent Council	468
4.3.	Seminars, Symposia, Meetings	468
4.4.	Training Programmes for NGOs	469
4.5.	Media	470
4.6.	Mission Support	470
4.7.	Contact Point on Roma and Sinti Issues	470
4.8.	CIS Migration Conference	471
5.	Security Co-operation	471
5.1.	The Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting	471
5.2.	Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC)	472
5.3.	Code of Conduct	472
5.4.	Global Exchange of Military Information	472
5.5.	A Framework for Arms Control	472
5.6.	CSBM summary	473
6.	Other Activities	473
6.1.	Integration of recently admitted participating States	473
6.2.	The Economic Dimension	474
6.3.	Press and Public Information	475
III.	The Parliamentary Assembly	476
IV.	Relations with International Organizations and Institutions	477
V.	Relations with partners for co-operation (PCs)	478
VI.	Contacts with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)	479



VII. Administration and Finance	480
1. Finance	480
1.1. Financial Regulations	480
1.2. Budgeting	480
1.3. Accounting	481
1.4. Cash Management	481
2. Personnel	481
2.1. Staff Regulations	481
2.2. Internal Procedures	481
2.3. Recruitment	482
3. Information Systems	482
3.1. Operational Matters	482
3.2. New Developments	482
4. Legal Matters	482
5. Other Administrative Activities	482

## *I. Introduction*

The reporting period (October 1995 – October 1996) was marked by an expansion of OSCE operations. The Budapest Ministerial decision on OSCE involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina posed the greatest challenge ever confronted by the CSCE/OSCE. It tested the degree of preparedness of the Organization to take on the most complex tasks in the post-Cold War multi-institutional set-up.

Thus far, the track record of the OSCE in Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly the job done in the context of elections in that country, testifies that the Organization can cope with the most difficult challenges of our day. Elections supervised by the OSCE were a major step in the post-conflict rehabilitation of the country.

The OSCE has assisted the parties to the Dayton Agreement in their negotiations on arms control and confidence-building measures and has helped with the implementation and verification of the resulting accords. The negotiations on confidence-building measures ended with a comprehensive agreement; the arms control talks were crowned with the Agreement on Sub-Regional Arms Control.

The OSCE Assistance Group in Chechnya continued to operate under most arduous conditions. Headway was made with the conclusion of an agreement and OSCE involvement continues to be welcomed.

An addition to the OSCE operational inventory was the OSCE Mission to Croatia launched - at the invitation of the Croatian Government - by a decision in April of the Permanent Council. The Mission, making use of the expertise available to the High Commissioner on National Minorities and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and co-operating closely with - among others - the United Nations Transitional Administration in Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES), the Council of Europe, the European Community Monitoring Mission (ECMM), the UN Special Envoy for Regional Issues, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and relevant NGOs, is assisting the Croatian authorities and interested individuals, groups and organizations in the field of the protection of human rights and of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities.

All other OSCE missions in the field remained active, with the exception of the Mission to Kosovo, Sanjak and Vojvodina, which is still dormant in the absence of agreement by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) that it should resume its operations. The missions are continuing to make important contributions to stability in the OSCE area. Despite excellent track records recognized by all concerned, none of the missions has yet completely fulfilled its mandate and been disbanded.

In the absence of a political agreement it proved impossible to launch an OSCE Nagorno-Karabakh peacekeeping operation. However, the ceasefire has been holding for more than two years now and talks are continuing.

The High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) has been pursuing his discreet diplomacy in the OSCE area. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has stepped up its activities in the human dimension, co-operating closely with other international organizations and, in the case of election monitoring, with parliamentarians.

The OSCE is taking follow-up steps in connection with the Pact on Stability in Europe. Exercising the OSCE's repository function, the Secretariat has established a register of agreements deposited with the OSCE pursuant to the Pact. The OSCE stands ready to provide assistance in resuming the work of regional tables.

The speedy integration of recently admitted participating States (RAPS) remained high on the OSCE list of priorities. Through educational and training seminars and workshops organized by OSCE institutions in this category of States, the message is being sent that the OSCE cares.

The OSCE Liaison Office in Central Asia has been in operation for over a year now. In May the Permanent Council, having reviewed its operation, decided to extend its mandate by two years and increase its personnel strength. The Troika visit to the region in September generated further political support for the democratization programmes under way there.

The Organization maintained regular contacts with other international organizations, with NGOs, and with States partners for co-operation. In its contacts with other international organizations, the OSCE has continued to explore ways of avoiding duplication of effort, through mutually enhancing co-operation based on the principle of comparative advantages.

Fully aware of the potential of NGOs, the OSCE has conducted a study on ways of increasing their involvement and taken steps to implement recommendations arising from the study.

In the wake of the Budapest Summit, the OSCE's Mediterranean effort has been stepped up. Regular contacts with the Mediterranean partners for co-operation were maintained at various levels through a special contact group. Regional seminars and a special meeting on terrorism were held. Significant input to the OSCE operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was made by partners for co-operation Japan and Korea and by some Mediterranean partners for co-operation.

Under the Swiss Chairmanship, the OSCE continued its quest for new approaches to conflict prevention and crisis management and to the military aspects of security. The discussion on a common and comprehensive security model for Europe for the twenty-first century intensified and deepened.

The OSCE's tasks and operations have increased significantly in the course of 1996. The involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina alone has led to almost a doubling of the OSCE budget. However, the OSCE remains a low-cost, un-

bureaucratic and lean-staffed organization. Proposals for restructuring the Secretariat, in order to ensure more effective operations, have been submitted to the participating States for discussion.

## *II. Activities of the OSCE*

### *1. Political Consultations and Negotiations*

Throughout the reporting period a major issue was the security model discussion. The Permanent Council (PC) continued to play its central role as a forum for consultations as well as for enhancing the operational strength of the Organization. It provided political guidance for missions in the field and, responding to rapidly changing realities, decided new initiatives.

With the PC playing its full role, the frequency of Senior Council meetings was reduced.

As a contribution to the security model discussion, the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) engaged in a debate on a framework for arms control – which would serve also as a basis for its own future agenda. As part of its regular activities, the FSC paid increased attention to the implementation of confidence- and security-building measures. The Secretariat, through the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), supported the FSC in these activities.

### *2. Early Warning, Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management*

#### *2.1. Missions of Long Duration*

Eleven OSCE missions of long duration and other field activities have been serving as an effective tool of early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management. These activities are based on mandates - elaborated by the participating States - which take into consideration the specific features of the situation in the host country. Their tasks vary from, for example, assisting the host country in the process of democratic transformation, to stabilizing post-conflict situations, by helping in the process of national reconciliation.

Despite the great diversity of situations, OSCE missions of long duration perform an early-warning task and enable the Organization to take prompt action in order to defuse tensions and find lasting solutions in some areas of major concern to the international community.

### *2.1.1. Mission of Long Duration in Kosovo, Sanjak and Vojvodina*

The Mission continued to be non-operational as the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) has made the Mission's reactivation conditional on the country's return to the OSCE.

Nevertheless, given the OSCE's commitments and concerns *vis-à-vis* those regions, it was possible to find other ways of monitoring the situation there.

The Mission's reporting has been partly replaced by analyses from OSCE participating States. Information conveyed to an ad hoc working group is submitted weekly to the PC.

The situation in Kosovo continues to arouse particular concern. However, one encouraging development was the agreement on educational matters between the Serbian central authorities and ethnic Albanian political leaders in Kosovo, which allows the return of ethnic Albanian pupils and teachers to the State educational system.

### *2.1.2. Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje*

Since the conclusion of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (the Dayton Agreement) and of an agreement on mutual recognition between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and given the continuing presence of United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) on the northern and western borders of the host country, the Mission's border-monitoring role has further diminished. Within the framework of its mandate, the priorities of which were adjusted during the year, the Mission has continued to monitor the situation, both internally and externally, also in the context of regional stability, security and co-operation.

The Mission has co-operated closely with the United Nations, other international organizations and with NGOs in co-ordinating efforts to assist the host State with the development of its democratic institutions. Together with the United Nations, it organized an international workshop entitled "An Agenda for Preventive Diplomacy", which was held in Skopje in the autumn of 1996. The Mission has continued to support the work of the High Commissioner on National Minorities. In May 1996 it organized a marathon team relay linking the cities of Skopje and Tetovo, which drew teams from all parts of the community.

### *2.1.3. Mission to Georgia*

The Mission sought further ways of carrying out its primary task - facilitating a settlement of the South Ossetian conflict. The Head of Mission (HoM) was one of the five parties to the "Memorandum to Enhance Security and Confidence-Building Measures" signed at the Kremlin in the presence of Presi-

dents Yeltsin and Shevardnadze on 16 May 1996. On 23 July the HoM and three other Mission members took part in the first meeting since July 1995 of the Joint Control Commission (JCC), established in 1994 to find practical solutions to the problems arising from the conflict.

Further impetus towards a political settlement was given by a meeting between President Shevardnadze and the South Ossetian leader Chibirov, held on 27 August in Vladikavkaz, where both sides committed themselves to proceed on the road to a comprehensive settlement of the Georgian-Ossetian conflict.

The next step will be negotiations on the future status of South Ossetia, conducted by high-ranking representatives of the parties concerned. The consent of the South Ossetian leadership to the opening in Tskhinvali of a branch office of the OSCE Mission is considered to be an encouraging sign.

The Mission's main tasks were threefold: first, to help preserve the ceasefire through daily monitoring visits to the checkpoints of the peacekeeping forces in the conflict zones; second, to act as intermediary between President Shevardnadze and the South Ossetian leader Chibirov and keep the negotiating efforts alive; and third, to facilitate a Georgian-Ossetian information flow through informal contacts, such as a round table in Tskhinvali attended by journalists from the opposing sides, and exchanges of media material.

Another element of the overall conflict settlement effort - the Mission's economic initiative, aimed at the revival of a normal economic fabric within South Ossetia and between it and adjacent areas - gained pace after February 1996, with extensive visits by several international experts who examined the prospects in various sectors. As regards the refugee dimension of the conflict, in July the HoM presented senior officials on both sides with proposals for facilitating the return of Ossetian refugees to Georgia's Borjomi area; the paper in question was subsequently introduced into the framework of the JCC.

In Georgia's other conflict zone, Abkhazia, the Mission continues to be active on human rights, with members visiting the area almost monthly. Both sides seem to consider such visits a useful means of bringing about greater co-operation as regards access to detained persons and the investigation of alleged human rights violations. In June 1996, for the first time, Mission members visited Abkhaz prisoners held by Georgia and Georgian prisoners held by the Abkhaz side. The opening of a human rights office in Sukhumi (due to be inaugurated on 10 December 1996), under United Nations auspices and with OSCE support, was decided by the UN Security Council on 22 October 1996. Thanks in part to the support of the Council of Europe to OSCE efforts in the field, there was a considerable increase in the Mission's activities in the sphere of human rights, where Georgia has generally continued to make good progress. Mission interaction with the Georgian judiciary and Ministry of the Interior rose markedly. Staff of the Mission's Human Rights Office made numerous visits to persons held in detention facilities, and Mission members

regularly attended trials with political connotations in Tbilisi. Through ODIHR seminars, expertise was made available in areas such as prison reform, human rights NGOs capacity-building and ombudsman law. The number and regularity of the Mission's contacts with local NGOs concerned with human rights and democracy-building rose appreciably.

The Mission managed to slightly increase its delivery of humanitarian aid and intensify support of the distribution to those refugee populations outside the Abkhazia conflict zone whose situation was judged to be most severe. With regard to South Ossetia, the Mission is recognized as a co-ordinator of international humanitarian aid efforts.

#### *2.1.4. Mission to Estonia*

At the beginning of 1996, the Mission followed closely the work being done on a new local election law; for this purpose, it was represented at the meetings of the Parliamentary committee drafting the law. The Mission has also monitored the citizenship examinations, which began during December 1995 pursuant to Estonia's Citizenship Law.

Throughout 1996, the Mission monitored the progress of the residence permit processing, which in the second half of the year reached the residence permit and aliens' passport issuing stage.

The Mission continued to concern itself with issues relating to Estonian language training for russophone inhabitants, such training being a major prerequisite for genuine integration, and helped to channel foreign aid into language training projects.

During 1996 the Mission followed and supported round tables in Estonia where representatives of different sections of the population discuss broad topics, including cultural and educational issues.

#### *2.1.5. Mission to Moldova*

Progress was achieved in the negotiations on a settlement of relations between the Republic of Moldova and its eastern part. The parties concerned, with the support of the mediators (the OSCE Mission, the Russian Federation and Ukraine), prepared a "Memorandum on the Principles of Settlement of Relations between Moldova and Trans-Dniestra". This document determines basic aspects of a special status for the eastern part of Moldova and deals with possible guarantees for implementing the agreements on a final settlement. The signing of the Memorandum is expected to take place after the presidential elections in late 1996.

Within the framework of these negotiations, specific problems regarding the relationship between the two sides, Moldova and the eastern part of Moldova, were discussed. The Mission, together with the other mediators, participated in both the elaboration and the implementation of the resulting agreements.

New "Principles of Co-operation with the Joint Control Commission" (JCC) were signed in January 1996. This document lays the foundations for more active involvement of the Mission in the JCC's activities.

Military units from the Russian Federation's Operational Group in the eastern part of Moldova were used in the rotation of the Russian peacekeeping contingent in June. The Moldovan side opposed the move, alleging that it was a violation of the 1992 Russian-Moldovan agreement and considered it a threat to the implementation of the 1994 agreement on the withdrawal of Russian troops (the former 14th Army).

The Mission reported regularly about the long-term implementation of the relevant provisions of the Budapest Document 1994 and monitored the situation of military forces in the region.

As regards the human dimension, the Mission investigated the conditions in Moldova's penitentiaries, where humanitarian aid is urgently needed, and followed the "Ilascu group" case (Ilie Ilascu and five other men were sentenced to death by the authorities of the eastern part of Moldova for an alleged politically motivated assassination in 1993).

#### *2.1.6. Mission to Latvia*

The Mission monitored the implementation of the 1994 Citizenship Law and the 1995 Law on Non-Citizens. It continued to co-operate closely with the Naturalization Board. With the approval of the Board's director, Mission members monitored the conduct of naturalization examinations, which they concluded were being administered in a fair manner.

The Mission continued its dialogue with the Citizenship and Immigration Department on the implementation of the Law on Non-Citizens. Also, the Mission played the role of third-party facilitator – in relation to the troop withdrawal agreements of April 1994 – with regard to the retired military personnel from the Russian Federation remaining in Latvia.

#### *2.1.7. Mission to Tajikistan*

During 1996 the three field offices that were taken over from UNHCR on 1 October 1995 proved very useful in monitoring the human rights situation of returned Tajik refugees. In addition, thanks to a wider interpretation of their mandate, they successfully addressed some other very difficult issues of human rights and fundamental freedoms, such as the independence of political parties, freedom of the press, the independence of the judiciary and the penitentiary system. The Mission co-operated closely with the ODIHR, UNHCR, the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General and the United Nations Military Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT), as well international organizations such as the ICRC.



On 22 February, the Permanent Council (PC) approved OSCE involvement - including financial support - for the establishment of an ombudsman office, foreseen in a draft presidential decree which had been under discussion for almost a year. Although the Tajik Government eventually decided otherwise, the OSCE Mission has expressed its readiness to assist the Government, whenever necessary, in creating an independent institution which will serve to strengthen human rights and democracy.

From 24 to 26 April the OSCE Department for Chairman-in-Office Support held a Regional Seminar on Confidence-Building. The Seminar - the first of its kind to be held in Tajikistan - brought delegations from each of the five Central Asian countries together with senior OSCE representatives, delegations from other OSCE participating States and representatives of international and local NGOs.

The Mission continued to follow the inter-Tajik talks taking place under the chairmanship of the United Nations.

#### *2.1.8. Mission to Sarajevo*

Early in 1996 the Mission to Sarajevo was expanded and reorganized into a section of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

#### *2.1.9. Mission to Ukraine*

During the period January to June, the Mission focused on constitutional issues, primarily the elaboration and adoption of a Crimean constitution. A round table, organized by the HCNM and the Mission in Noordwijk, Netherlands, on 13 and 14 March, had a positive impact on the constitutional debate in Ukraine. The Ukrainian Constitution, adopted on 28 June 1996, recognizes an "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" with its own constitution, a provision that is important for continuing political stability in Crimea. Moreover, the Noordwijk round table initiated a process whereby the Ukrainian Parliament, on 4 April 1996, adopted a partial constitution for Crimea, partial in the sense that some twenty critical articles in the document must still be correlated with Ukrainian law.

After the January-June period, the Mission shifted its focus to issues affecting deported peoples, particularly Tatars. A number of reports were produced, and the Mission organized a seminar in Kyiv on Ukrainian citizenship issues as they relate to Tatars and other former deportees from Crimea.

Attended by senior Ukrainian and Crimean officials, Tatar leaders and foreign experts, the seminar resulted in a number of commitments that should help to mitigate the citizenship problem in the near term. Also, it may stimulate renewed legislative and political activity that could resolve the problem definitively within a reasonable time.

In order to maximize the use of resources and experience, the Mission to Ukraine is working closely with the HCNM and increasing its co-operation with bodies like the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNHCR.

#### *2.1.10. Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina*

The OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina was established on 8 December 1995 at the fifth meeting of the Ministerial Council. The Hungarian Chairman-in-Office appointed Ambassador Robert Frowick of the United States as Head of Mission.

With an authorized staff of 233 members and with dozens of international personnel supporting it (mainly from the ECMM and Civil Military Co-operation/Implementation Force (CIMIC/IFOR)), the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina is so far the biggest OSCE field mission.

The OSCE and its Mission were given the task of supervising the preparation and conduct of free and fair elections and monitoring the human rights situation. Furthermore, the OSCE is to be involved in facilitating the monitoring of arms control and confidence- and security-building arrangements.

#### *Elections*

The OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina has assisted the parties in creating the conditions required for holding elections: a politically neutral environment, the right to vote in secret without fear of intimidation, freedom of expression and of the media, freedom of association and freedom of movement.

The Provisional Elections Commission (PEC), set up pursuant to the Dayton Agreement, had its first meeting on 1 February 1996, and the basic rules and regulations for elections were adopted on 22 February. A Free Elections Radio Network (FERN) was launched with the assistance of the Swiss Government, in order to provide at least one channel of communication to which all political parties would have equal access; FERN became operational on 15 July. The Open Media Network television station started broadcasting in September.

The elections provided for in the Dayton Document were to take place six to nine months after the Agreement had been signed. On 25 June, the Chairman-in-Office concluded that there was no convincing alternative to the holding of Presidential and Parliamentary elections, which took place on 14 September. In August, the PC decided that the also-envisaged municipal elections should be postponed until November because of widespread violation of the PEC rules and regulations. In October, these elections were postponed again and should take place as early as possible in 1997.

More than 1,200 election supervisors from OSCE participating States assisted the authorities. Nearly 900 international observers co-ordinated by Mr. van

Thijn, the Co-ordinator of International Monitoring (CIM), monitored, on 14 September, the elections which, on 29 September, the PEC certified had taken place in accordance with internationally accepted standards of eligibility, access, participation, and transparency.

#### *Human rights*

Thanks to the establishment of field offices and the appointment of observers, the Mission was able to report on human rights violations and the human rights situation in general, with particular emphasis on election-related human rights such as freedom of movement, freedom of expression and freedom of association. Also, it assisted in establishing contacts between local human rights organizations. Special attention was paid to the development of inter-ethnic contacts and dialogue among intellectuals, religious leaders, journalists, women and youth.

#### *Regional stabilization*

An agreement between the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska on confidence- and security-building measures in Bosnia and Herzegovina was concluded on 26 January under the chairmanship of Ambassador Gyarmati, a Special Representative of the Chairman-in-Office. The implementation of the agreement started on 1 March 1996. An agreement designed to assist the parties in achieving balanced and stable defence force levels at the lowest numbers consistent with their respective security needs was reached on 14 June under Ambassador Eide, also a Special Representative of the Chairman-in-Office.

The OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina has worked in close co-operation with other international actors, including the ECMM, IFOR, the Office of the High Representative (OHR), the International Ombudsman, the Human Rights Chamber, the Office of the CIM, and the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY).

#### *The Federation Ombudsmen*

After the establishment of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina in December 1995, the old Mission (the OSCE Mission to Sarajevo) was integrated into the new one, which took over responsibility for supporting - politically and logistically - the three Federation Ombudsmen who represent the three major ethnic groups. An Ombudsmen Liaison Unit has been set up within the Human Rights Branch of the new Mission.

The Ombudsmen have concentrated on questions of property rights, citizenship and freedom of movement, endeavouring to create conditions which will allow people to return to their homes. Also, they have touched upon problems related to misapplication of the Amnesty Law. Furthermore, through the media, they keep the public informed about their work and simultaneously educate it about human rights.

The Ombudsmen Liaison Unit has been seeking non-OSCE sources of funding so as to enable the Ombudsmen to work more effectively and to extend their activities into new areas.

#### *The Human Rights Commission*

The Human Rights Commission, established pursuant to the Dayton Agreement, is a national body which will have an international character for the first five years of its existence. It consists of a Human Rights Chamber and a Human Rights Ombudsman. The Commission as a whole started its work officially on 27 March 1996.

*Human Rights Ombudsperson.* The Hungarian Chairman-in-Office appointed Ms. Gret Haller of Switzerland as the OSCE Human Rights Ombudsperson for Bosnia and Herzegovina in December 1995. She took up her duties on a permanent basis in mid-February. The Human Rights Ombudsperson will serve for a non-renewable term of five years.

*The Human Rights Chamber.* The Human Rights Chamber consists of 14 members. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe has appointed eight members, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina has appointed four, and Republika Srpska has appointed two. The Council of Europe has elected Professor Peter Germer of Denmark as President of the Chamber. The term of the Human Rights Chamber is five years; its present term started on 15 March 1996.

#### *2.1.11. Mission to Croatia*

In the light of a report on an OSCE fact-finding Mission to Croatia (October 1995), and a report of a Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on his visit to that country (February 1996), the PC decided on 17 April 1996 to establish a long-term OSCE mission, at the invitation of the Croatian Government.

The main task of the Mission is to provide assistance and expertise to the Croatian authorities at all levels – and also to interested individuals, groups and organizations – in the field of protection of human rights and of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities. In order to promote reconciliation, the rule of law and conformity with the highest internationally recognized standards, the Mission will in this context also assist with, and advise on, the implementation of legislation and monitor the development and functioning of democratic institutions, processes and mechanisms.

In carrying out its tasks, the Mission will co-operate with the HCNM and the ODIHR, other international institutions and organizations (notably the Council of Europe), the ECMM, the Special Envoy for Regional Issues, UNHCR, the ICRC and relevant NGOs. The PC highlighted the need for the Mission to co-operate closely with UNTAES.

The OSCE Mission to Croatia became operational on 5 July 1996, when Ambassador Albertus J.A.M. Nooij and a number of other Mission members took up their duties in Zagreb. In conformity with the PC's decision, field offices were opened in Vukovar and Knin in August.

## *2.2. Other OSCE Field Activities*

### *2.2.1. OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya*

Together with the Mission in Bosnia, it is OSCE's operation which attracts most public exposure. The Head of the Assistance Group is Ambassador Tim Guldemann of Switzerland who started his work on 4 January 1996.

The AG has been successful as a facilitator of contacts between the conflicting parties, playing a major role in bringing about the Moscow agreement and the two Nasran protocols. The Moscow cease-fire agreement recognized the merits of OSCE involvement by including the words "with the mediation of the OSCE Mission".

### *2.2.2. Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on the conflict dealt with by the Minsk Conference*

The Personal Representative had monthly meetings with the authorities of Armenia and Azerbaijan and the political and military leaders of Nagorno-Karabakh. In co-operation with his field assistants, he prepared special reports, mostly on questions connected with confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs).

As regards CSBMs aimed at stabilizing the cease-fire, the Personal Representative, in co-operation with the Parties, introduced a "mechanism of crisis monitoring" for the verification of allegations about cease-fire violations. A similar mechanism is to be elaborated to enable the Chairman-in-Office and

the Co-Chairmen of the Minsk Conference to get involved in the verification process.

The Chairman-in-Office, accompanied by representatives of the Minsk Group, visited the region in February 1996 and put forward a "package deal proposal" that has become the framework for further negotiations.

The Chairman-in-Office appointed Mr. Andrzej Kasprzyk of Poland as his new Acting Personal Representative; Mr. Kasprzyk took up his duties in July 1996.

### *2.3. OSCE Assistance in the Implementation of Bilateral Agreements*

#### *2.3.1. The OSCE Representative to the Latvian-Russian Joint Commission on Military Pensioners*

The Joint Commission on Military Pensioners continued to meet regularly. All sides noted a marked decrease in the number of complaints brought to the Commission's attention.

#### *2.3.2. The OSCE Representative to the Estonian Government Commission on Military Pensioners*

The Estonian Government Commission on Military Pensioners, tasked with the review of applications for residence permits by former career officers of foreign nationality, had managed to deal with the bulk of the applications by 12 July 1996 (the closing date fixed by the Estonian National Assembly) and relayed its recommendations to the Estonian Government.

The Government has in the meantime identified some 4,000 problem cases which are to be reconsidered for final decision within 6 months. This work, together with some 1,000 additional cases not yet reviewed, will occupy the Commission until the beginning of 1997.

#### *2.3.3. The OSCE Representative to the Joint Committee on the Skrunda Radar Station*

The OSCE Representative and Alternate Representative, appointed by the Chairman-in-Office on 6 April 1995, carried out in 1996 two periodic inspections in a businesslike and co-operative atmosphere.

#### *2.3.4. Sanctions Co-ordinator and Sanctions Assistance Missions (SAMs)*

The adoption of resolutions 1021 and 1022 on 22 November 1995 by the United Nations Security Council has considerably reduced the operational responsibilities of the SAMs in the neighbouring countries of the Federal Re-

public of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and of the EU/OSCE Sanctions Co-ordinator's Office in Brussels.

As a consequence, the number of customs officers and other experts serving the SAMs in Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Romania has substantially declined. As to the SAM in Ukraine, the Government requested that it be temporarily withdrawn on the understanding that the legal framework for a possible future presence of the SAM would remain in force.

With reference to the provisions of resolution 1022, the Permanent Council of the OSCE decided to extend the mandate of the SAMs and the EU/OSCE Sanctions Co-ordinator until 30 September 1996. In the light of subsequent developments, however, the Permanent Council did not decide to extend the mandate further.

On 1 October 1996 the United Nations Security Council adopted resolution 1074 which terminates with immediate effect the sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Republika Srpska. As a result, the EU/OSCE Sanctions Assistance Missions are winding up their activities. The Sanctions Assistance Mission Committee (SAMCOMM) will continue to operate, however, for the purpose of co-ordinating some 8000 ongoing investigations of suspected violations of sanctions and managing the Customs and Fiscal Assistance Office and the International Customs Observer Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

### *3. The High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM)*

It has long been accepted in the OSCE that stability and security are largely determined by the success or failure of States' policies *vis-à-vis* their national minorities. In recognition of the important contribution of the HCNM to the defusing of inter-ethnic tensions, his mandate was extended in the fall of 1995 for a second three-year term.

During the reporting period, the High Commissioner was again involved in minority questions in a number of OSCE participating States. Inter-ethnic relations were his main concern. The issues discussed covered a broad range among them, differences between national and regional authorities, prospects for the return of persons belonging to national minorities to areas they had previously inhabited and problems related to the possibility of obtaining citizenship. Also opportunities for members of minorities to secure education in their mother tongue and to use their native language were often discussed.

#### *3.1. Croatia*

The purpose of the HCNM's first visit to Croatia, from 14 to 17 December 1995, was to acquaint himself with the situation of national minorities within the specific context of the return of refugees and displaced persons. He had

talks with a number of senior officials in Zagreb, including Mr. Kofi Annan, Special Representative of the UN Secretary General; Mr. B. Suk Min, Chief of Mission, United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation (UNCRO); Mr. Pierre Jambor, Chief of the UNHCR Mission to Croatia; and Mr. J.M. Rodriguez Cordon, Acting Head of the ECMM.

The HCNM visited a refugee camp near the Bosnian border at Kupljensko, as well as Knin, in the Krajina, and there had meetings with the local authorities, with the military authorities and with the ECMM Team-Knin.

From 4 to 8 February 1996 the High Commissioner paid his second visit to Croatia, with meetings in Zagreb and Osijek, to familiarize himself with the special situation in the Croatian territories of Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium.

He met with the Deputy Prime Minister, the Ministers of Justice and the Interior, the Presidential advisor on Humanitarian Affairs and a number of Parliamentarians, including some of Serbian and other non-Croat ethnic origin. He also met UNHCR and UNTAES representatives.

The HCNM paid his third visit to Croatia from 9 to 13 June 1996. Prior to visiting Zagreb, the HCNM travelled to Vukovar and a number of neighbouring villages in eastern Slavonia. He also went to Osijek, the administrative centre of the region, which is also the seat of the Croat office for liaison with UNTAES.

### *3.2. Estonia*

The HCNM continued his involvement in Estonia, concentrating mainly on the question of citizenship, the issuing of aliens' passports and language requirements.

He discussed these issues during his visit from 30 November to 1 December 1995, and from 7 to 9 May 1996, when he met with President Lennart Meri, the Foreign Minister and the Vice-President of the Parliament. In talks with the Director of the Citizenship and Migration Board, the High Commissioner indicated that, upon his recommendation, the Swiss Government would provide funds for computer equipment to help the Board with its task of registering applications for temporary residence permits and aliens' passports.



### 3.3. *The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*

The HCNM visited the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in March 1996, following his earlier visits there in March and May 1995. His attention was now focused on the prevailing political situation and the latest developments in inter-ethnic relations. Particular importance was attributed to the question of Albanian language education, including ways of improving opportunities for Albanians to enjoy higher education in their mother tongue within the framework of national legislation.

### 3.4. *Hungary*

The HCNM continued to direct attention to the situation of the Slovak minority in Hungary and was supported in his activities by a team of three experts. In addition to meetings in Budapest, the experts visited one of the largest and oldest Slovak settlements in Hungary, Bekescaba, in the southern part of the country.

The team of experts again accompanied the High Commissioner on a trip to Hungary from 20 to 22 May.

In the summer of 1996 the HCNM had several meetings with Hungarian Foreign Minister Kovacs in connection with the draft Basic Treaty between Hungary and Romania which was eventually finalized in August 1996.

### 3.5. *Kazakhstan*

Late in 1995 and on into 1996, the HCNM continued to follow developments in Kazakhstan. A seminar on inter-ethnic relations was held in February 1996. Entitled "Building Harmonious Inter-Ethnic Relations in the Newly Independent States - the Instance of Kazakhstan", the seminar was co-organized by the HCNM, the Foundation on Inter-Ethnic Relations, the Administration of the President of Kazakhstan and the Foreign Ministry. Discussion centred on four key themes: the relevance of international legal norms for domestic policy-making on minority issues and inter-ethnic relations; the development and implementation of language policy in a multilingual State; the role of State bodies in local minority affairs; and the need for effective dialogue between minority representatives and State authorities.

### 3.6. *Kyrgyzstan*

In April 1996 the HCNM turned his attention to the inter-ethnic situation in Southern Kyrgyzstan. After meetings with officials in Osh and Djalal-Abad, he subsequently visited Bishkek to share his impressions with Government officials.

### *3.7. Latvia*

The HCNM continued his activities in Latvia, visiting the country in January 1996 to pursue further questions connected with the naturalization process. He had meetings with the Latvian authorities, as well as representatives of political parties and of the Russian speaking community. On 16 May 1996 the High Commissioner took part in a seminar in Riga aimed at promoting dialogue between the government and residents belonging to minorities. This seminar was organized by the Latvian Centre for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies with the support of the Foundation on Inter-Ethnic Relations and the Soros Foundation in Latvia.

### *3.8. Romania*

During his visit of 28 August to 1 September 1995 in Romania, the High Commissioner focused his attention on the new Law on Education, adopted on 29 June 1995. In a public statement, he referred to clarifications he had received from the government on several issues, such as the freedom of parents to choose a school or class for their children, the fact that the law did allow the existence of private denominational schools, and the possibility that these schools might receive State support. Also, the possibility of minorities contributing to Romanian history textbooks was mentioned.

He subsequently recommended that the passing of regulations on the implementation of the law be speeded up in an effort to avoid confusion, and that thought be given to the possibility of revising the law, perhaps in early 1997, to overcome unforeseen weaknesses that might lead to over-regulation in the initial period of application.

### *3.9. Slovakia*

The HCNM continued his efforts to improve relations between the Slovak Government and the sizeable Hungarian minority in Slovakia.

Linguistic issues were tackled during the High Commissioner's visit in January 1996. The HCNM visited Slovakia again from 22 to 24 May 1996, accompanied by a team of experts, and met with two Deputy Prime Ministers and a number of Ministers. The HCNM had the opportunity to discuss the situation of Hungarian-language schools with representatives of the Hungarian minority.

### 3.10. Ukraine

A further round table meeting on the political, economic and legal problems dividing the Ukrainian authorities and the Crimean parliament was held in Noordwijk (the Netherlands) from 14 to 17 March 1996. Organized by the HCNM in collaboration with the OSCE Mission to Ukraine and the Foundation on Inter-Ethnic Relations, the meeting was attended by high-level representatives from Crimea and Kyiv. The debates led to the formulation of some new concrete approaches, hopefully useful for bridging the remaining differences.

On 2 April 1996, the HCNM took part in the UNDP-sponsored Donor Conference on the deported people of Crimea, in Geneva. He then spent two days in Kyiv focusing on constitutional matters.

## 4. *The Human Dimension: Activities of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights*

In 1996 new tasks assigned to the OSCE under the Dayton Accords added to the normal workload of the ODIHR. The three main roles for the OSCE in Bosnia and Herzegovina were: supervision of the electoral process, monitoring of human rights, and provision of assistance to the Parties to facilitate arms-control and confidence-building measures.

The ODIHR's support for the OSCE Mission in Bosnia lay in providing assistance with elections; assistance to the ombudspersons; and assistance in the process of creating modern legislation.

### 4.1. Election Monitoring

In accordance with a new framework for election monitoring, the ODIHR focuses its efforts on the periods prior to and following elections in participating States. This allows the experts to make thorough enquiries into the situation as regards the political rights of citizens.

The ODIHR has been very active in arranging and sponsoring various activities since November 1995 in relation to elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This work has involved the organization of the initial Election Assessment Missions, the drafting of new electoral codes for Bosnia and Herzegovina and the training of new members of the OSCE Mission, as well as sending observers to the elections themselves.

In 1996, the ODIHR observed the parliamentary elections in Russia (December 1995) and Albania (May and June 1996); the local elections in Romania (June), the presidential elections in Russia (June) and Armenia; the parliamentary elections in Lithuania (October); the presidential elections in Bulgaria (October) and Moldova (November); and the presidential and parliamentary elections in Romania (November).

#### *4.2. Integrating the Human Dimension in the Work of the Permanent Council*

The procedures decided upon at the Budapest Summit in 1994 suggested a significant change in the way the OSCE will deal with Human Dimension issues in the future. More emphasis is to be given to integrating the Human Dimension into the work of the Permanent Council.

The Director and staff members of the ODIHR have regularly attended Permanent Council meetings and provided delegations with monthly information on its activities. As a consequence, there has been a regular exchange of ideas between the Office and the Permanent Council.

#### *4.3. Seminars, Symposia, Meetings*

*4.3.1. Rule of Law and Democratic Institution Building.* The Third Annual Warsaw Judicial Symposium, held from 10 to 14 June, involved jurists and ministry officials from across Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. It offered participants an opportunity to learn about new legal trends and techniques to improve the administration of justice in their countries.

*4.3.2. Professional Training Programme for Russian Judges,* 10-13 July, Orel, Russia. This training workshop, entitled "The Role of Regional Courts in the Implementation of International Human Rights Commitments", was the second phase of the Professional Training Project designed by the Programme for Co-ordinated Legal Support. The principal objective of the workshop was to determine the feasibility of using regional courts to implement a national training project which has been developed by the Supreme Court of Russia and the ODIHR.

*4.3.3. Training Programme for Belarus Government Migration Officials,* 15-19 July, Warsaw. This event was organized in co-operation with UNHCR. The agenda, prepared with the assistance of the Polish Migration and Refugee Affairs Office of the Ministry of the Interior, provided Belarus officials with a substantive review of the new legal and organizational policies that guide Polish refugee and migration affairs.

*4.3.4. Training Project for the Georgian Ministry of Justice and Georgian Prosecutor General,* 6-8 September. The programme focused on prison reform and management and reviewed the application of international standards to the Georgian penal system and the practical implications of penal reform.

*4.3.5. Seminar on Human Rights and International Standards of the Judiciary,* 28-30 May, Dushanbe. This programme, involving the participation of

all courts and other bodies and representatives of the justice sector from throughout the country, was the first project of its kind in Tajikistan. The objective was to stimulate discussion on the practical implementation of international legal standards and to examine ways in which those standards could serve as an effective guarantee of fair legal process and as a basis for the fight against organized trans-national crime.

4.3.6. *Workshop on Human rights in Prisons*, 16-19 February, Erevan. This workshop focused on such topics as "The Purpose of Prison", "Prisoners and the Outside World" and "European Conventions on Human Rights in Prison".

4.3.7. *Round table on Legal Aspects of the Ombudsman Institution*, 11-12 March, Tbilisi, Georgia. A follow-up to the ODIHR's recent evaluation of the draft constitutional law on the Ombudsman of Georgia, this round table was primarily designed to encourage the Georgian parties involved to discuss selected legal issues.

#### *Human Dimension Seminars*

4.3.8. *Constitutional, Legal and Administrative Aspects of the Freedom of Religion*, 16-19 April, Warsaw. The main theme of the Seminar was freedom of religion, in its relationship to State and church bodies as well as religious communities and organizations. Delegations reported on efforts, notably in the new democracies, to incorporate OSCE standards into their constitutions.

#### *4.4. Training Programmes for NGOs*

- Round Tables on Women's Issues, Kyrgyzstan (September) and Uzbekistan (October)
- Capacity Building and Communication for NGO Leadership – Training Workshops in Lithuania and Georgia (May), in Armenia and Azerbaijan (both in July) and in Moldova (October).
- The Role of Education in Strengthening Civil Society: Workshop in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (11-13 September) and in Estonia (29-31 October).

#### 4.5. *Media*

Bearing in mind that the development of independent media is one of the primary prerequisites for the functioning of a civil society, the ODIHR has given close attention to observing media campaigns before and during elections, heightening awareness of Human Dimension issues, especially media-relevant issues, through seminars and workshops, and collecting and disseminating information on the implementation of OSCE commitments with relation to the media. The ODIHR has also organized regional conferences and meetings of journalists.

The Seminar on Conflict in the Trans-Caucasus and the Role of Mass Media, 22-26 April, Batumi, Georgia, was organized by the OSCE Mission to Georgia, the Council of Europe and the Black Sea Press Agency. Twenty-five media professionals from the regions of conflict attended the conference. Participants discussed the possibility of establishing contacts and channels for future communications among themselves. They also turned their attention to the role, responsibilities, ethics and influence of journalistic work on the peace-building process in their countries.

A meeting on Conflict in the Former Yugoslavia and the Role of the Media, held in June, in Croatia, was organized within the framework of the ODIHR assistance programme for the rehabilitation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Journalists from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia discussed obstacles to independent and professional journalism, including such problems as the restricted availability of newsprint, penalties for advertisers and high taxes.

#### 4.6. *Mission Support*

The ODIHR continued to advise the Chairman-in-Office on the formulation of mandates before the creation of missions, often sending experts to take part in exploratory visits. It has also organized training courses for new members on the Human Dimension, on monitoring and on reporting techniques. It regularly informs missions of its activities and supplies them with human rights documentation.

#### 4.7. *Contact Point on Roma and Sinti Issues*

*Co-operation with the OSCE participating States.* To obtain direct insight into the situation of the Roma minority in each participating State, the CPRSI circulated a questionnaire in order to collect comprehensive information about the Roma populations in individual States.

*Co-operation with international organizations.* The ODIHR Co-ordinator of the Contact Point on Roma and Sinti Issues participated from 15 to 21 May in

the fact-finding mission on the situation of Roma organized by the Council of Europe. In addition, the ODIHR co-operated closely, in this context, with the European Commission and UNHCR.

*Co-operation with Romani organizations.* Regular consultations are held on Roma and Sinti issues and on the current activities of the CPRSI. The Standing Conference for Co-operation and Co-ordination of Romani Associations in Europe is an important partner in all current activities of the CPRSI.

*Activities to combat violence and discrimination.* A workshop on violence against Roma and Sinti was organized in January 1996 in Warsaw, and was followed by several consultations on this problem with Romani associations. The CPRSI prepared a report on violence and discrimination against Roma in Europe and discussed it with the representatives of interested governments.

*Increasing awareness of Roma and Sinti Issues.* In September 1996 a seminar on attitudes towards the Roma in the media, organized jointly by the Project on Ethnic Relations and the CPRSI, was held in Prague.

#### 4.8. *CIS Migration Conference*

Increasingly aware of the scale and complexity of the problem of migration in CIS countries, UNHCR and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) - together with the OSCE - organized a Conference on this subject in June 1996. A joint Secretariat staffed by the three organizations had been established in 1995 to deal with preparations for the Conference and to provide relevant information for the international community.

The Conference brought together all the CIS countries and other interested States, and it helped to encourage discussions on humanitarian issues.

The Conference has achieved several objectives starting from its preparatory phase, through intensive work carried out by the participating States in two rounds of sub-regional meetings and two meetings of experts.

### 5. *Security Co-operation*

#### 5.1. *The Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting*

The sixth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (1996 AIAM) of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) took place in Vienna from 4 to 6 March 1996. The participation of numerous experts from capitals offered the opportunity to discuss suggestions for improvement of the existing Vienna Document 94 and other FSC agreements, such as the Code of Conduct and the Global Exchange of Military Information.

Up to 1 August 1996 the following decisions on improvement / further development of existing CSBMs have been taken:

- Establishment of a common five-year period for air base visits

- Definition of the role of the Conflict Prevention Centre within the OSCE network
- Extension of the time frame for submission of Defence Planning Information to 3 months

#### *5.2. Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC)*

The FSC, recalling the importance of an early entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention, decided that there should be a regular exchange of information on the status of ratification of the CWC and ensuing legislation.

#### *5.3. Code of Conduct*

The Implementation of the Code of Conduct was reviewed during the AIAM 96. As a consequence, the introduction of a separate ad hoc annual review meeting is under consideration. Two seminars (December 1995 and May 1996) organized by the Netherlands and Germany, respectively, bore testimony to the substantial progress made in implementing the Code in a number of OSCE participating States.

#### *5.4. Global Exchange of Military Information*

OSCE participating States successfully conducted their Global Exchange of Military Information on 30 April 1996. The exchange was preceded by a workshop on automated data exchange with an encouraging number of participants.

#### *5.5. A Framework for Arms Control*

Working Group B of the FSC established an informal working group to discuss the future framework for arms control as a contribution to the elaboration of a security model for the twenty-first century. The framework, adopted in September, is to be finalized before Lisbon and adopted at the Summit itself.



## 5.6. CSBM summary

In 1996 a number of the CSBMs mentioned in the Vienna Document 94 have already been successfully carried out by OSCE participating States. They include:

- 4 air base visits
- 66 evaluation visits
- 21 inspections
- 2 demonstrations of new types of major weapon and equipment systems
- 4 visits to military facilities
- 7 observations of military activities

## 6. Other Activities

### 6.1. Integration of recently admitted participating States.

6.1.1. In 1996, the most notable of OSCE's activities in this field was the *Troika visit* to the countries of Central Asia, which took place from 9 to 13 September. The goals of the visit, the first of this format ever, were manifold: to promote more active participation in the OSCE of the countries concerned and better understanding of the OSCE's possibilities and constraints, to identify security concerns, to establish the role that the OSCE can play through preventive diplomacy, and to increase public awareness of Central Asian participation in the OSCE. In all countries the Troika delegation was received at the highest level and had positive exchanges of views on further integration into the Organization of the States in the area.

6.1.2. As part of its programme of seminars and other meetings in Central Asia, the OSCE organized a symposium in Tashkent, Uzbekistan on 23 April and a seminar in Dushanbe, Tajikistan from 24 to 26 April. This two-city event, planned by the Department for Chairman-in-Office Support of the OSCE Secretariat, was organized jointly with the authorities of the host States. The OSCE Central Asian Liaison Office in Tashkent and the OSCE Mission to Tajikistan were also actively involved. The meetings were opened by the Prime Ministers of the two host States and attended by over 100 participants from the OSCE community. There was also wide participation by representatives of international organizations, international and local NGOs and the media. Members of opposition parties were likewise able to take part in the Dushanbe seminar.

The symposium in Tashkent, entitled "*OSCE Comprehensive Security and Regional Challenges*" generated lively discussions on a broad range of issues of particular interest to the OSCE and its Central Asian members.

The Dushanbe *Seminar on Confidence Building* was the first major OSCE event to be organized in Tajikistan. Discussions covered a broad range of issues, including problems of conflict prevention, regional economic and environmental co-operation and solidarity, democratic institutions, human rights and the rule of law.

6.1.3. A *Seminar on National Human Rights Legislation* was held from 11 to 13 September 1996 in Tashkent. This Seminar was attended by the Troika delegation and focused on legal issues related to the protection of human rights.

6.1.4. In Tajikistan, the OSCE, through its mission in the field, participated in the preparation of a *Workshop on Small and Medium-sized Business in the Leninabad region*. The workshop was co-organized with the UNDP and the Tajik Centre for Entrepreneurship and Management. Held in Khojand, on 9 and 10 August 1996, it brought together more than 50 business leaders and several international organizations to discuss and assess the economic situation in Leninabad Oblast, the most industrialized region of the country.

6.1.5. The *OSCE Liaison Office in Central Asia*, operational since July 1995, has established contacts with representatives of all Central Asian States at various levels in fulfilment of its mandate. It has disseminated information about the OSCE and assisted in the organization of OSCE-related regional events. In recognition of its important role, the office's mandate has now been extended for a two-year term.

## 6.2. *The Economic Dimension*

6.2.1. The first *OSCE Economic Dimension Implementation Review Meeting* (22 and 23 January, Geneva) took stock of what had been achieved during the period 1990-1995 in relation to the OSCE's commitments in the areas of economics, the environment and science and technology. The Chairman's Summary of the meeting's conclusions was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Economic Forum.

6.2.2. The *Fourth Meeting of the Economic Forum* (27-29 March, Prague) addressed the social aspects and political risks of the transition process and the role of economic confidence-building in promoting security. The meeting highlighted a wide range of social and economic elements of security relevant to the discussion on a common and comprehensive security model for the twenty-first century.

On the eve of the Economic Forum, participants from the business community discussed the idea of establishing a privately initiated and financed

"European Business Council", a body expressing the views of the private sector which could act as a recognized interlocutor of the OSCE.

6.2.3. A framework for private sector development, industrial co-operation and direct investments in the CIS countries was the subject of a *Seminar* organized in Minsk (24-26 September) in close co-operation with the UN/ECE, OECD and the Executive Secretariat of the CIS. This meeting was part of the 1996 seminar programme associated with the Economic Dimension of the OSCE and designed to promote economic confidence for both domestic and foreign investors.

### 6.3. *Press and Public Information*

#### 6.3.1. *Press*

The Secretariat continued to keep the press and the general public aware of the activities of the OSCE, thereby also supporting accordingly the Chairman-in-Office.

The number of press releases and press briefings has risen significantly. High profile events like OSCE election monitoring, or the activities of the Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina and of the Assistance Group to Chechnya, have generated considerable press interest.

The practice of inviting journalists to visit OSCE missions (for example in Moldova and Tajikistan) has met with a favourable response.

#### 6.3.2. *Public Information*

A major initiative was the creation of an OSCE web site. With the co-operation of all OSCE bodies and institutions, and effective technical assistance from the Prague Office, this site became operational in October 1996. It provides the Internet users with OSCE information in an immediate, straight-forward and digestible manner.

A new, visually striking and user-friendly "image brochure" was introduced, giving the reader a colourful and informative overview of the history and activities of the Organisation.

The marked increase in requests for public information and archival material from both the Vienna Secretariat and the Prague Office suggests that there is a growing interest in the activities of the OSCE.

Circulation of the monthly Newsletter has increased to above 1,500 and efforts have been made to improve its presentation and broaden the scope of its coverage. A bi-monthly Russian synopsis of the Newsletter has also gone into regular production with the co-operation of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations.

### 6.3.3. Publications

A second issue of the OSCE Handbook, prepared by the Department for Chairman-in-Office Support, provided the reader also in 1996 with comprehensive factual information on the institutions, activities and mechanisms of the OSCE. A Russian version of the handbook was also produced.

A compilation of articles on the OSCE in 1995, entitled "The OSCE in 1995: the Year in Print", was prepared by the Department for Chairman-in-Office Support. A further publication from the same source was entitled "From CSCE to OSCE", a collection of statements and speeches of the then Secretary General Dr. Wilhelm Höynck.

As in the past, four issues of the ODIHR Bulletin were published. The "Roma and Sinti Issues Newsletter" began a second year of circulation. The ODIHR also launched a new publication this year, entitled "Central Asian and Transcaucasian Newsletter".

### III. The Parliamentary Assembly

Established in accordance with the call of Heads of State or Government at the Paris Summit in 1990, the Parliamentary Assembly has increased its role, particularly through dialogue between parliamentarians and governments on OSCE issues. Its declarations and resolutions deal with current matters. The Annual Assembly Session in Stockholm, last July, met in plenary and in three committees corresponding to the three main OSCE baskets. The dominant subjects were the security model for the twenty-first century and the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Assembly adopted recommendations made by the three General Committees for inclusion in the final Stockholm Declaration. Two supplementary resolutions on Turkey and the former Yugoslavia were also adopted. The Assembly also considered a text on a "Code of Conduct on Politico-Democratic Aspects of Co-operation" prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee chaired by Professor Rita Süßmuth, President of the German Bundestag. It was decided to forward "The Code of Conduct" to the Lisbon Summit. The Assembly established an annual Prize for Journalism and Democracy that was awarded to the Polish journalist, Mr. Adam Michnik. At the Stockholm session, Mr. Javier Ruperez, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Spanish Parliament, was elected as the new President of the Assembly.

The Assembly provided a vital link between the OSCE and members of the national Parliaments of the participating States. It has become a tradition that reports of the Committees and decisions of the Assembly are transmitted to the Ministerial Council for consideration, while senior OSCE officials and experts brief the Parliamentarians on the latest OSCE developments. The President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Mr. Javier Ruperez, re-

ported on the results of the Stockholm Session to the Permanent Council in Vienna in July and participated in the Troika meeting last September.

Another major contribution by the Assembly to the development of representative democracy during the past twelve months was its election monitoring programme. Almost three hundred parliamentary observers monitored elections in Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Russia (twice – parliamentary and presidential elections), and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Assembly closely co-operated with the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and the ODIHR.

The Assembly sent missions to the Baltic States and the Central Asian countries, headed by its then President, Mr. Frank Swaelen, and to Georgia and Armenia, headed by the newly elected President, Mr. Javier Ruperez. As a result, an intensive programme of seminars has been developed for the Central Asian and Transcaucasian countries.

An international internship programme, at the Headquarters of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Copenhagen, has been extremely beneficial to graduate students from OSCE countries and has considerably enhanced the research and language capabilities of the Assembly's International Secretariat. During the past year, interns from over a dozen OSCE countries compiled briefing materials for election monitoring teams, helped delegations during their missions and assisted at seminars and Assembly Sessions.

#### *IV. Relations with International Organizations and Institutions*

Inter-institutional co-operation in preventive diplomacy and post-conflict rehabilitation expanded.

The Secretary General attended the second meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations, chaired by Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali at United Nations Headquarters in New York, on 15 and 16 February 1996. The discussions concentrated on improving co-operation, information exchange, the enhancement of consultations and on possibilities for joint operations.

In the framework of the enhanced interaction between the United Nations and regional organizations, co-operation and co-ordination between the OSCE and the United Nations are intensifying, particularly in the fields of conflict prevention and crisis management. Continuing political support was afforded by the Security Council to OSCE efforts to find a solution in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The OSCE participated as an observer in United Nations-led negotiations to settle the conflict in Tajikistan and was invited to the UN-sponsored talks on Abkhazia. The United Nations received regular information on OSCE field activities based on mission reporting from Moldova, Georgia, Estonia, Latvia, Ukraine, and Chechnya.

The General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (the Dayton Agreement) involves an unprecedentedly wide range of international organizations, with the OSCE in the forefront. During its first meeting in Sarajevo in January 1996, the OSCE Troika discussed with IFOR commanding officers plans for co-operation between the military and the civil implementation organizations in Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to provide a co-ordinated response to the challenges of post-conflict peace-building.

Trilateral contacts between the OSCE, the United Nations and the Council of Europe continued, as did direct contacts between OSCE institutions and UN offices, agencies and programmes. In December 1995, representatives of the UN Office in Geneva, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the Council of Europe (CoE) and the International Committee of the Red Cross discussed with OSCE representatives prospects for co-operation in the field. Further OSCE-UN-CoE meetings are planned.

An OSCE - CoE "2+2" meeting was held in Strasbourg on 23 January 1996.

On 11 July 1996, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr. Daniel Tarschys, addressed the OSCE Permanent Council. In his speech, he emphasized the importance of contacts between the Council of Europe and the OSCE Missions and the High Commissioner on National Minorities.

The OSCE Secretary General, addressing Ministers' Delegates at the Council of Europe on 15 October, spoke of the increasing need for complementarity in order to avoid overlapping and contradictions and maximize the use of resources.

#### *V. Relations with partners for co-operation (PCs)*

Co-operation and interaction of the OSCE with its PCs Japan and the Republic of Korea and its Mediterranean PCs Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Morocco and Tunisia, increased further.

Another Mediterranean Seminar was held in Tel Aviv, Israel, from 2 to 4 June 1996. The topic was "The OSCE as a Platform for Dialogue and the Fostering of Norms of Behaviour". In addition to representatives from 31 of the OSCE's participating States, the seminar was attended by representatives from Egypt, Israel, Morocco and Tunisia.

The participants stressed that dialogue should be increasingly based on common values and a shared definition of security, leading to principles which all States in the region can subscribe to.

Further discussions on how to enhance dialogue and co-operation between the OSCE and its Mediterranean PCs continued in the Mediterranean Contact Group (MPC) in Vienna, focusing on topics such as confidence-building measures, the application of OSCE principles in the Mediterranean region and the adoption of co-operative strategies for dealing with common concerns like organized crime, drug trafficking and natural disasters.

An MPC meeting on "Risks and Challenges to European Security: the Mediterranean Dimension" was held on 1 and 2 July in Vienna. The participants identified issues of common concern in connection with the spread of terrorism and discussed possible avenues of international co-operation in tackling this scourge.

#### *VI. Contacts with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)*

The Organization continued to refine its patterns of co-operation with NGOs, in line with the recommendations made in the "Study on Enhancement of NGO Participation" released by the Secretary General in September 1995 in response to the request made in the Budapest Document.

Within the OSCE Secretariat, an NGO Liaison Officer has been appointed by the Secretary General to focus on relations with NGOs dealing with issues other than human dimension ones. On 6 May 1996, an expert consultation about "Integrating with Humanitarian and Development Programmes" took place.

As recommended in the "Study on Enhancement of NGO Participation", the number of NGOs invited to participate in regional meetings has increased. The addresses of relevant NGOs have been entered into the general distribution list of the Prague Office.

In addition to the Secretariat in Vienna, the Office for Democratic Institution and Human Rights (ODIHR) played a full role in liaising with NGOs.

On 20 and 21 March 1996, in Washington D.C., ODIHR representatives had a meeting with NGOs on the CIS Migration Conference. On 4-9 May, the ODIHR and the OSCE Mission to Georgia organized a training workshop for NGOs in Tbilisi on "Capacity Building and Communication for NGO Leadership". On 7 May, representatives of Slovak NGOs visited the ODIHR for a briefing on its activities. In June, the ODIHR and "Women's Rights Poland" organized a round table in Warsaw on women's issues.

Contacts with NGOs formed an essential part of the HCNM's preventive diplomacy missions to OSCE States, during which he focused on the role of NGOs as possible sources of information.

OSCE Missions maintained links with NGOs relevant to their respective mandates. In particular, the OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya and the OSCE Missions to Moldova, Georgia, Estonia and Skopje have established fruitful working relations with a number of NGOs.

Possible new avenues of co-operation are currently being discussed, including the enlisting of NGO representatives as members of OSCE missions and NGO involvement in the training of mission members.

#### *VII. Administration and Finance*

The main activities relating to Finance, Personnel, Information Systems, Legal Matters and other Administrative Tasks are described below.

## *1. Finance*

### *1.1. Financial Regulations*

Financial Regulations were approved by the Permanent Council on 27 June 1996.

### *1.2. Budgeting*

The Budget for 1996 was approved by the Permanent Council on 19 December 1995. It was initially established at a level of ATS 310.1 million. Shortly afterwards the Permanent Council approved a budget for OSCE tasks in Bosnia and Herzegovina at a level of ATS 244.9 million. This budget was revised on 27 June 1996. Thanks to savings in the budget, it proved possible to include additional funds for the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina amounting to about ATS 40 million.

The 1996 Budget was further increased to include provisions for internal auditing, the Review Conference and the Mission to Croatia. The budgets for Sanctions Assistance Missions and the Sanctions Co-ordinator were reduced. The total Budget for 1996 is currently (1 November 1996) established at a level of ATS 546.1 million.



### *1.3. Accounting*

The accounts for 1995 were submitted to the External Auditors on 18 March 1996. The report of the External Auditors included an unqualified audit opinion certifying that

- the financial statements present fairly the financial position of the OSCE as at 31 December 1995, and the results of the operations then ended;
- they were prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;
- transactions were in accordance with the approved financial procedures and legislative authority.

The audited financial statements for 1995 were submitted to the delegations of the participating States on 26 June 1996.

### *1.4. Cash Management*

The cash flow of the OSCE improved significantly in 1996 thanks to the establishment, on 11 January 1996, of the Voluntary Fund to support OSCE Action for Peace, Democracy and Stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The cash flow into the Fund has increased gradually. As at 15 October 1996 a total amount of ATS 493.8 million had been contributed in cash to the Fund. Of this amount ATS 272.3 million had been spent, leaving a balance of ATS 221.5 million.

New bank accounts were opened in Moscow and in various locations in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## *2. Personnel*

### *2.1. Staff Regulations*

The Informal Financial Committee, assisted by the Secretariat, has been considering the Draft Staff Regulations, which were submitted by the Secretary General to delegations in April 1995.

### *2.2. Internal Procedures*

Organizational Directives concerning recruitment (OD 8) and the selection and appointment of seconded staff (OD 9) were issued on 15 March 1996.

### *2.3. Recruitment*

Recruitment activities were intensified during the first half of 1996 owing to the need to fill temporary positions established in the Secretariat to support the Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## *3. Information Systems*

### *3.1. Operational Matters*

The resources of the OSCE's information systems were dedicated primarily to support the Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina, while at the same time providing the necessary infrastructure for an enhanced level of computerization in the Secretariat.

The Finance System has so far been successfully installed in the Missions to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Georgia.

### *3.2. New Developments*

All OSCE institutions and some missions were connected to the Internet.

The development of an OSCE-wide information systems strategy, planned for the first half of 1996, had to be deferred owing to work requirements related to Bosnia and Herzegovina. This task has now been relaunched.

## *4. Legal Matters*

Legal assistance was required and provided throughout the period of the Report in many areas, notably Staff Regulations and employment questions, Financial Regulations, Contracting, Insurance matters, Memoranda of Understanding and other international instruments, privileges and immunities and social security.

## *5. Other Administrative Activities*

The High Level Planning Group was moved by the end of 1995 to new offices in the Secretariat at 1010 Vienna, Kärntner Ring 5-7. Also, additional office space had to be rented in the same premises to accommodate the staff employed pursuant to Annex 1 B of the Peace Agreement concerning Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## Code of Conduct on Politico-Democratic Aspects of Co-operation

adopted by

### The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Stockholm, 9 July 1996

#### *Preamble*

The participating States of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE),

Expressing their conviction that the full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the development of societies based on pluralistic democracy and the rule of law are prerequisites for progress in setting up the lasting order of peace, security, justice and co-operation,

Aware of the close interrelationship between internal and external democratic structures and the fact that the presence of democratic structures is an indispensable prerequisite for both the resolution of domestic political problems and for building confidence between states thereby promoting peace and security,

Taking into account the close interrelationship between the three "baskets" of the Helsinki Final Act, and convinced that peace and security, social justice and economic stability, and democracy and respect for human rights are closely interlinked,

Recognizing the importance of economic, social and cultural rights embodied in the 1948 United Nations Declaration on Human Rights,

Considering that the end of the Cold War has increased the interdependency among states and that major problems cannot be solved by national means alone, and emphasizing the growing need for co-operation,

Stressing that international conflicts and problems between states must be solved by peaceful political means only, condemning the use of force by one state against another,

Recognizing the importance of the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security,

Recognizing the need to enhance democratic co-operation, including through the further encouragement of norms of responsible and co-operative behaviour in the area of the Human Dimension of the OSCE,

Emphasizing the importance of conflict prevention and preventive diplomacy in potential conflicts, and committing themselves to taking full advantage of the facilities offered by the OSCE,

Confirming that nothing in the Code diminishes the validity and applicability of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations or other provisions of international law,

Reaffirming the undiminished validity of the guiding principles and common values of the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris, the Helsinki Document 1992 and the Budapest Document 1994, as embodying the responsibilities of States towards each other and of governments towards their own people,

Underlining the democratic rights of citizens to demand from their governments respect for these guiding principles and common values,

Reaffirming that the consolidation of democracy in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union is a priority of the OSCE, and therefore encouraging the development of a "Partnership for Democracy" programme,

Have adopted the following Code of Conduct on politico-democratic aspects of co-operation:

#### *I. Human Dimension Commitments*

1. The participating States emphasize that the full respect for all OSCE principles embodied in the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris, and the implementation in good faith of all commitments undertaken in the OSCE are of fundamental importance for democratic progress, peaceful relations and expanding co-operation.
2. They have agreed that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, democracy, the rule of law, economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility are common and immutable aims, and an essential component of security and co-operation in the OSCE region.
3. They declare that the commitments undertaken in the field of the Human Dimension of the OSCE are matters of direct and legitimate concern to

all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned.

4. The relations between the participating States will rest on their common adherence to democratic values and to human rights and fundamental freedoms. They reaffirm the equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and with the relevant norms of international law, including those relating to the territorial integrity of States and the inviolability of borders.

5. Reaffirming their respect for each other's sovereign equality and individuality as well as the rights inherent in and encompassed by its sovereignty, the participating States will base their mutual political relations upon a co-operative approach. They emphasize in this regard the key role of the OSCE. The participating States will co-operate in ensuring the implementation of all OSCE principles and commitments under this Code.

## *II. Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*

6. The participating States solemnly declare that human rights and fundamental freedoms are the birthright of all human beings, are inalienable and must be guaranteed by law. Their protection and promotion is the first responsibility of government.

7. They reaffirm their determination to continually advance the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act, as well as all other OSCE commitments relating to the protection of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all persons. The participating States recall that within the framework of the OSCE special attention has been drawn to women, children, disabled persons, indigenous populations, migrant workers, persons belonging to national minorities, refugees, displaced and deported persons.

8. They solemnly declare that all persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law must prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground.

9. They reaffirm that everyone has the right to a nationality and that no one should be deprived of her/his nationality arbitrarily.

10. They express their conviction that the protection of human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to national, ethnic, cultural, religious, and/or linguistic minorities, is an essential foundation of democratic civil society. Neglect of these rights does, in severe cases, contribute to extremism,

regional instability and conflict. They condemn intolerance discrimination, aggressive nationalism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and racism and stress the vital role of tolerance, understanding and co-operation in the achievement and preservation of stable democratic societies.

11. Each participating State will take appropriate measures within its constitutional framework and in conformity with its international obligations, where this has not already been done, to assure to everyone on their territory protection against discrimination on grounds of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, sexual orientation, religion, and political conviction, as well as to protect all individuals, including foreigners, against acts of violence, including on any of these grounds.

12. The participating States strongly condemn all forms of torture as one of the most flagrant violations of human rights and human dignity. They commit themselves to strive for its elimination. They recognize the importance in this respect of international norms as laid down in international treaties on human rights, in particular the United Nations Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

*i. Democracy and Freedom*

13. Each participating State will ensure that everyone will have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes the freedom to change one's religion or belief and the freedom to manifest one's religion or belief in accordance with the dictates of her/his own conscience, either alone or in community with others, in public or in private, through worship, teaching, practice and observance. The exercise of these rights may be subject only to such restrictions as are prescribed by law and are consistent with international standards.

14. Each will ensure that everyone will have the right of peaceful assembly and demonstration. Any restrictions which may be placed on the exercise of these rights will be prescribed by law and consistent with international standards.

15. Each will guarantee the right of association. The right to form and, subject to the general right of a trade union to determine its own membership, freely to join a trade union will be guaranteed. These rights will exclude any prior control. Freedom of association for workers, including the freedom to strike, will be guaranteed, subject to limitations prescribed by law and consistent with international standards.

16. Recalling that pluralism is important in regard to political organizations, each will respect the right of individuals and groups to establish, in full freedom, their own political parties or other political organizations and provide such political parties and organizations with the necessary legal guarantees to enable them to compete with each other on a basis of equal treatment before the law and by the authorities. Each will ensure a clear separation between the State and political parties. The financing of political parties must be transparent.

*ii. Promotion of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*

17. The participating States have committed themselves to ensure the rights of the individual to know and act upon human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to contribute actively, individually or in association with others, to their promotion and protection.

18. They have agreed that human rights education is fundamental and that it is therefore essential that their citizens are educated on human rights and fundamental freedoms.

19. Each participating State will respect the rights of everyone, individually or in association with others, to seek, receive and impart freely views and information on human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the rights to disseminate and publish such views and information, and to study and discuss the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

20. The participating States will allow members of non-governmental organizations which seek the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including trade unions and human rights monitoring groups, to have unhindered access to and communication with similar bodies within and outside their countries and with international organizations, to engage in exchanges, contacts and co-operation with such groups and organizations and to solicit, receive and utilize for the purpose of promoting and protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms voluntary financial contributions from national or international sources as provided for by law.

*III. Democratic Order*

21. The participating States recall their commitment in the Charter of Paris to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of their nations.

22. They emphasize that democracy, with its representative and pluralistic character, entails accountability to the electorate, an obligation of public authorities to comply with the law and that justice is administered impartially.
23. They declare that the will of the people, freely and fairly expressed through periodic and genuine elections where all political parties and organizations and candidates, including those representing the opposition, have equal opportunities, is the basis of the authority and legitimacy of all government. They condemn unreservedly forces which seek to take power from a representative government against the will of the people as expressed in free and fair elections and contrary to the justly established constitutional order.
24. They emphasize that the separation of powers among the legislative, executive and judicial branches is essential for a truly democratic order.
25. They recognize that democratic government depends on the ability of democratic institutions to function effectively. In order to do so, the structure and authority of institutions need to be backed by informed and active public support and broadly based acceptance in the society which they serve. They will promote democratic culture as a necessary element for the functioning of democratic government and for resolving internal disputes by peaceful and democratic means.
26. Each participating State will defend and protect, in accordance with its laws, the democratic order freely established through the will of the people against the activities of persons, groups or organizations that engage in or refuse to renounce terrorism or violence aimed at the overthrow of that order or of that of another participating State.
27. In case of overthrow or attempted overthrow of a legitimately elected government of a participating State by undemocratic means, the participating States will support vigorously, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the legitimate organs of that State upholding human rights, democracy and the rule of law.
28. Each participating State will ensure that its military and paramilitary forces, internal security and intelligence services, and the police are subject to the effective direction and control of the appropriate civil authorities. Each will take steps to create, wherever they do not already exist, and maintain effective arrangements for legislative supervision of all such forces, services and activities.
29. Each participating State will take all necessary measures to ensure that law enforcement personnel will act in the public interest, respond to a spe-



cific need and pursue a legitimate aim, as well as use ways and means commensurate with the circumstances, which will not exceed the needs of enforcement. Further, each will ensure that law enforcement acts are subject to judicial control, that law enforcement personnel are held accountable for such acts, and that due compensation may be sought, according to domestic law, by the victims of acts found to be in violation of the above commitments.

30. Each participating State will in all circumstances respect and ensure respect for international humanitarian law including the protection of the civilian population. Each participating State will ensure that there is adequate information and training within their military services and law enforcement personnel with regard to the provisions of international humanitarian law and consider that relevant information should be made available. Each will hold those who violate international humanitarian law personally accountable.

31. They restate their unreserved condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism and will co-operate to eliminate this threat to security, democracy and human rights.

*i. Free and Fair Elections*

32. To ensure that the will of the people serves as the basis of the authority of government, each participating State will hold free elections at reasonable intervals, as established by law; permit seats in at least one chamber of the national legislature to be freely contested in a popular vote; guarantee universal and equal suffrage to adult citizens and ensure that votes are cast by secret ballot and that they are counted and reported honestly with the official results made public.

33. Each participating State will ensure that law and public policy work to permit political campaigning to be conducted in a fair and free atmosphere in which neither administrative action, violence nor intimidation bars the parties and the candidates from freely presenting their views and qualifications, or prevents the voters from learning and discussing them or from casting their vote free of fear of retribution. Each will provide that no legal or administrative obstacle stands in the way of unimpeded access to the media on a non-discriminatory basis for all political groupings and individuals wishing to participate in the electoral process.

34. The participating States consider that the presence of observers, both foreign and domestic, can enhance the electoral process for States in which elections are taking place. They therefore invite observers from any other OSCE participating State and any appropriate institutions and organizations,

in particular inter-parliamentary organizations, who may wish to do so to observe the course of their national election proceedings, to the extent permitted by law. They will also endeavour to facilitate similar access for election proceedings held below the national level, including in areas inhabited by national minorities.

ii. *Representative and Accountable Government*

35. The participating States solemnly declare that government must be representative in character. Such government is one in which the executive is accountable to the elected legislature or the electorate.

36. Each participating State will ensure that legislation will be formulated and adopted as the result of an open process reflecting the will of the people, either directly or through their elected representatives. Each will also ensure that legislation, adopted at the end of a public procedure, and regulations will be published and made easily available to the public.

iii. *Independence of the Judiciary*

37. The participating States recognize that the independence and authority of the judiciary is a crucial element in safeguarding the rule of law and securing effective implementation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. An independent judiciary serves to uphold the integrity of other democratic institutions, reinforce their effectiveness, and prevent abuse of power. Accordingly, each participating State will ensure the independence of judges and the impartial operation of the public judicial service, and recognize and protect the independence of legal practitioners.

38. Each will respect the internationally recognized standards that relate to the independence of judges and legal practitioners and the impartial operation of the public judicial service including, *inter alia*, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

39. The participating States will promote and facilitate dialogue, exchanges and co-operation among national associations and other groups interested in ensuring respect for the independence of the judiciary. They will further co-operate among themselves on an ongoing basis in such areas as the education and training of judges and legal practitioners.

40. They recognize the jurisdiction of international courts and tribunals created by treaties or other arrangements to which they are a party and commit themselves to respecting and complying with their rulings.

iv. *Rule of Law and Due Process*

41. The participating States reaffirm the right to the protection of private and family life, domicile, correspondence and electronic communications. The exercise of this right will be subject only to such restrictions as are prescribed by law and are consistent with internationally recognized human rights standards.

42. They will treat all persons deprived of their liberty with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person and will respect the internationally recognized standards that relate to the administration of justice and the human rights of detainees. Each participating State will ensure that no one will be deprived of her/his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedures as are established by law and are consistent with internationally recognized human rights standards. Each will also ensure that any person who has been deprived of her/his liberty will be promptly informed about her/his rights and that everyone will be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law.

43. Each participating State will ensure that anyone who is arrested will be informed promptly in a language which she/he understands of the reason for her/his arrest, and will be informed of any charges against her/him. Each will also ensure that any person arrested or detained will have the right to be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law and in accordance with international standards to determine the lawfulness of her/his arrest or detention.

44. Each will adopt effective measures, where this has not already been done, to provide that law enforcement bodies do not take undue advantage of the situation of a detained or imprisoned person for the purpose of compelling her/him to testify against any other person. Each will ensure that the duration of any interrogation and the intervals between them will be recorded and certified, consistent with domestic law.

45. Each will ensure that no one will be charged with, tried for or convicted of any criminal offence unless the offence is provided for by a law. Each will ensure that in the determination of any criminal charge against her/him, or of her/his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone will be entitled to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. Each will also ensure that anyone charged with a criminal offence will have the right to defend herself/himself in person or through legal assistance of her/his own choosing or, if she/he has not sufficient means to pay for legal assistance, to be given it free when the interests of justice so require.

46. Each will ensure that any person arrested or detained will have the right, without undue delay, to notify or to require the competent authority to notify appropriate persons of her/his choice of her/his arrest, detention, imprisonment and whereabouts; any restriction in the exercise of this right will be prescribed by law and in accordance with international standards.

v. *Right to Effective Remedies*

47. The participating States recognize the right of the individual to effective remedies. They emphasize that administrative decisions against a person must be fully justifiable and must as a rule indicate the usual remedies available. Each participating State will ensure that everyone will have an effective means of redress against administrative decisions, so as to guarantee respect for fundamental rights and legal integrity. Each will also ensure that anyone who has been the victim of an unlawful deprivation of her/his liberty will have a legally enforceable right to seek compensation.

48. Each will ensure that a person who has been deprived of her/his liberty or her/his counsel will have the right to make a request or complaint regarding her/his treatment, in particular when torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment has been applied, to the authorities responsible for the administration of the place of detention and to higher authorities, and when necessary, to appropriate authorities vested with reviewing or remedial power. Each will also ensure that such request or complaint will be promptly dealt with and replied to without undue delay; if the request or complaint is rejected or in case of inordinate delay, the complainant will be entitled to bring it before a judicial or other authority; neither the detained or imprisoned person nor any complainant will suffer prejudice for making a request or complaint.

49. The participating States recognize, in conformity with national legislation, the right of interested persons and groups to initiate and support complaints against acts of discrimination, including racist or xenophobic acts. They will consider accepting those international mechanisms which allow States and individuals to bring communications relating to discrimination before international bodies.

vi. *Free and Independent Media*

50. Each participating State will respect the right to freedom of expression, including the right to communication and the right of the media to collect, report and disseminate information, news and opinions. Any restriction in the exercise of this right must be prescribed by law and in accordance with inter-

national standards. The participating States recognize that independent and pluralistic media are essential to a free and open society and accountable systems of government and are of particular importance in safeguarding human rights and fundamental freedoms.

51. They will not discriminate against independent media with respect to affording access to information, material and facilities. Each participating State will respect the right of the public to enjoy free and easy access to information and the right to impart information and ideas without interference by public authority regardless of frontiers, including through foreign publications and foreign broadcasts. Any restriction in the exercise of this right will be prescribed by law and in accordance with international standards.

52. The participating States recall their commitments undertaken to protect and advance the conditions of journalists in the legitimate pursuit of their professional activity. Each participating State will ensure that, in pursuing this activity, journalists, including those representing media from other participating States, are free to seek access to and maintain contacts with public and private sources of information, including organizations and official institutions, and that their need for professional confidentiality is respected.

53. The participating States will adopt, where appropriate, all feasible measures to protect journalists engaged in dangerous professional missions, particularly in cases of armed conflict, and will co-operate to that effect. These measures will include tracing missing journalists, ascertaining their fate, providing appropriate assistance and facilitating their return to their families.

#### *IV. Democracy and Co-operation*

54. The participating States recognize the importance of taking a co-operative approach to fulfil all OSCE commitments and in the conduct of their external relations. They commit themselves to exhaust all means of preventive diplomacy in cases of conflict and crisis situations and will draw primarily upon OSCE resources in the areas of early recognition of conflicts, conflict prevention and conflict management

55. They recognize co-operation as an inseparable element of a democratic order. They will co-operate in the field of, *inter alia*, constitutional, administrative, environmental, commercial, civil and social welfare laws and other relevant areas, in order to further develop legal systems based on respect for human rights, the rule of law and democracy. In this respect they recognize the importance of inter-parliamentary co-operation and the work carried out

by inter-parliamentary bodies, in particular the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

56. They endeavour to develop a "Partnership for Democracy" programme to support, improve and strengthen democracy in the entire OSCE region.

57. They recognize the positive role of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights and that, in addition to the ordinary court system, including administrative courts, such institutions could comprise constitutional courts, national human rights commissions, complaints commissions, Ombudsmen or mediators. They emphasize their common interest in promoting contacts and the exchange of information amongst Ombudsmen and other institutions entrusted with similar functions of investigating individual complaints of citizens against public authorities.

58. They will continue and enhance bilateral and multilateral legal and administrative co-operation, *inter alia*, in the development of an efficient administrative system and an impartial and effective public service where recruitment and advancement are based on a merit system, in formulating law and regulations, and in the education and training of administrative and legal staff.

59. They will endeavour, in order to strengthen democratic participation and institution building and in developing co-operation among them, to share their respective experience on the functioning of democracy at a local and regional level, including issues pertaining to local government and decentralization. Accordingly they will facilitate contacts and encourage various forms of co-operation between bodies at local and regional level.

60. The participating States, recalling the provisions of the Final Act and all other commitments made within the framework of the OSCE pertaining to human contacts, endeavour to facilitate freer movement and contacts, individually and collectively, whether privately or officially, among persons, institutions and organizations of the participating States and to contribute to the solution of the humanitarian problems that arise in that connection.

61. They support fully the United Nations and the enhancement of its role in promoting international peace, security and justice. They reaffirm their commitment to the principles and purposes of the United Nations as enshrined in the Charter, in particular in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

62. They will consider becoming a party to, where they have not already done so, and adhering to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,

as well as all other relevant Treaties, Covenants and Protocols, in particular those which are referred to in the framework of the OSCE.

63. They reconfirm that issues of implementation of OSCE commitments are of legitimate and common concern to all participating States, and they encourage the raising of these problems in the co-operative and result-oriented spirit of the OSCE. They encourage implementation of OSCE commitments through enhanced dialogue, implementation reviews and mechanisms, as well as through other instruments available within the framework of the OSCE. They will improve contact and practical co-operation with international organizations and institutions, including regional and non-governmental organizations, active in human dimension areas.

64. They will recognize as NGOs those which declare themselves as such, according to existing national procedures, and will facilitate the ability of such organizations to conduct their activities freely on their territories. To that effect they will further strengthen modalities for contacts and exchanges of views between NGOs and relevant national authorities and governmental institutions and facilitate visits to their countries by NGOs from within any of the participating States in order to observe human dimension conditions, including, *inter alia*, observing compliance with OSCE commitments in the field of the human dimension. They will allow NGOs to convey their views to their own governments and the governments of all the other participating States.

65. They will endeavour to promote mutual understanding and confidence, friendly and good-neighbourly relations among themselves, international peace, security and justice. They will equally endeavour to improve the well-being of peoples and contribute to the fulfilment of their aspirations through, *inter alia*, the benefits resulting from increased mutual knowledge and from progress and achievement in the economic, scientific, technological, social, cultural and humanitarian fields, including democracy and the rule of law.

#### V. Implementation

66. Each participating State is responsible for implementation of this Code. If requested, a participating State will provide appropriate clarification regarding its implementation of the Code. Appropriate OSCE bodies, mechanisms and procedures will be used to assess, review and improve if necessary the implementation of this Code.

67. In case a participating State fails to comply with this Code or any commitments undertaken in other CSCE or OSCE documents, the participating

States are urged to make use of all appropriate OSCE instruments and mechanisms, in particular the Human Dimension or Moscow Mechanism as set forth in the Vienna Concluding Document and amended at the Copenhagen and Moscow Meetings of the Conference on the Human Dimension, at the Second Meeting of the Council in Prague and at the Helsinki Summit.

#### *VI. Final Provisions*

68. The provisions adopted in this Code of Conduct are politically binding. Accordingly, this Code is not eligible for registration under Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations. This Code will come into effect on ...

69. Nothing in this Code alters the nature and content of the commitments undertaken in other CSCE or OSCE documents.

70. The participating States will seek to ensure that their relevant internal documents and procedures or, where appropriate, legal instruments reflect the commitments made in this Code.

71. The text of the Code will be published in each participating State, which will disseminate it and make it known as widely as possible.



## A Future Security Agenda for Europe

*Report of the Independent Working Group established by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), published in October 1996.*

### Contents

Preface	498
Findings of the Independent Working Group	500
1. The European security agenda towards the 21st century	500
Establishment of the Independent Working Group	501
The mandate	501
The new security environment	501
2. Risks and challenges	503
3. Goals and principles	505
4. What kind of institutions and for what?	506
Improving the functions of institutions	507
Crisis response	507
Military-related export controls	508
Transformation of NATO	508
Transformation of the EU	509
The Commonwealth of Independent States	509
The OSCE	509
The Council of Europe	510
5. Conclusions	510
Recommendations	511

## *Preface*

This report seeks to make a specific contribution to the ongoing debate in Europe on a future security system. It reflects the deliberations of the participants of the Independent Working Group (IWG) on A Future Security Agenda for Europe established by SIPRI. In all, nearly 60 participants from various regions of Europe, Russia and the United States were engaged in the work of the IWG. The participants of the three meetings, often expressed differing views on a number of specific issues under consideration; however, our intention was not to negotiate a single agreed document but to make an intellectual contribution to the ongoing debate.

The issue of a new system of security for Europe is both the subject of numerous studies carried out in various research institutions and the focus of attention of the multilateral intergovernmental security structures, such as NATO, the European Union (EU), the Western European Union (WEU), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the Council of Europe. Participants in the talks and negotiations carried out within these organizations concentrate, naturally, only on the aspects which correspond to their respective mandates. Our intention was to point out the new problems and challenges which are of a multidimensional nature and go beyond the framework of the structures existing in Europe. This found its expression in both the background papers and the discussions of the Independent Working Group. The first, 'brainstorming' session took place in Budapest (2 December 1995), in cooperation with the Hungarian Institute of International Affairs and the Central European University. It involved the participation of about 25 researchers and officials, including Hungarian Prime Minister Gyula Horn and Foreign Minister László Kovács. The meeting was chaired by Professor Daniel Tarschys, Chairman of the SIPRI Governing Board.

The second IWG meeting was held in Moscow (12-13 April 1996), in cooperation with the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), and involved politicians, representatives of research centres, and experts from Russia and other countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), including Nikolai Afanassevskiy, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation, as well as scholars and officials from other European countries and the USA. The meeting was co-chaired by Academician Vladlen Martynov, Director of IMEMO, and myself. In connection with this meeting, the Foreign Minister of Russia, Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, met informally with a group of the participants.

The third meeting was held in Geneva (23-24 May 1996), in cooperation with the Programme for Strategic and International Studies (PSIS) of the Graduate Institute of International Studies. It involved the participation of

scholars and officials, including the representative of the Swiss OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Ambassador Benedikt von Tscharnern, and the OSCE Secretary General, Dr Wilhelm Höynck. This meeting was co-chaired by Professor Curt Gasteyger, Director of the PSIS, and myself.

The findings of the IWG will be presented to the Swiss OSCE Chairman-in-Office in October 1996, with a request to make this report available to all the members of the OSCE.

Adam Daniel Rotfeld

*Findings of the Independent Working Group*

- The most serious threats to security in Europe after the cold war no longer arise from conflicts *between* states but from conflicts *within* states. Therefore, a fundamental change of security principles and procedures is needed.
- The new principle of solidarity should be recognized as an integral part of the set of rules governing security relations among the European states. The international community should have the right to 'cooperative intervention' in order to protect populations subjected to large-scale violence in domestic conflicts.
- The right to self-determination cannot be reduced to the right to secession. There is a need to define domestic rules for implementation of the principle of the self-determination of nations.
- The foundation of a new security system should be mutual reassurance rather than mutual deterrence, as was the case in the past. This will require sovereign states to cooperate on decisions about national security.
- Security institutions should follow the problems, and not the other way around. No single organization can handle all the security problems; nor is there a hierarchy among the security organizations.
- Pluralistic democracy, the rule of law and the respect for human rights, including the rights of minorities, are the basic prerequisites for international security.
- There is an urgent need for Western countries to enter into dialogue about security related issues with Russia, Ukraine and the Baltic states. The enlargement of NATO and the European Union must be carried out in a transparent, cooperative, non threatening and non-provocative way.
- European organizations should be prepared to consider new types of relationship with non-member countries, including association, treaty relationships and other means of outreach to open a dialogue with countries from regions which are adjacent to Europe.

*1. The European security agenda towards the 21st century*

Seven years since the Berlin Wall came down, the process of defining a new agenda for European security remains unfinished business. The new security system now taking shape is not being formed as the result of war, in the wake of which victors impose on the vanquished a new order and new rules of conduct. Rather, it is emerging gradually, through negotiation and agreement on common goals, norms, institutions and procedures.

### *Establishment of the Independent Working Group*

With its long engagement in the study of European security issues, SIPRI was encouraged to contribute to the security-building process now under way by senior political figures from a number of countries and by representatives of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). In co-operation with several research organizations, SIPRI established in the autumn of 1995 an Independent Working Group (IWG) on A Future Security Agenda for Europe.

In forming the IWG, our aim was not to duplicate the work carried out in Vienna under the auspices of the OSCE. Rather, it was to assess the progress that has been made in developing the multilateral security process in Europe and to discuss how the research community could promote this process.

### *The mandate*

The specific aims of the IWG were defined as:

- to assess the principal changes under way in the European security environment;
- to identify new risks and challenges and ways and means to meet them;
- to define the goals of the emerging security system and to elaborate its guiding principles; and
- to suggest some elements of reforms of existing institutions to enable them to cope with and manage the fundamental changes under way in Europe.

The backdrop to the discussion was the fact that the end of the cold war and the collapse of bipolarity had created conditions in which it became realistic to think about building a more stable and cooperative security system for Europe. Indeed, there has already been a wide range of encouraging developments. Our intention is to contribute to the ongoing debate about the future security system in Europe by offering an alternative, fresh perspective on key issues, unconstrained by official affiliations. This report is not intended solely for the consideration of government officials and policy makers, but we hope that it will provide them with food for thought about ways to consolidate security in Europe.

### *The new security environment*

The European security environment changed dramatically with the end of the cold war. German unification took place, Czechoslovakia split up, and on the

ruins of the two totalitarian federations - the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia - 20 new states were formed or re-emerged. The Warsaw Treaty Organization was dissolved, and new institutions, such as the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and the Partnership for Peace (PFP), were created.

Fundamental to the new security environment is the fact that, by the end of 1995, 30 states parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty) had reduced their heavy weapons by more than 50 000 items in the Atlantic-to-the-Urals area. Along with the Russian troop withdrawals from Central Europe and the Baltic states which were completed in 1994, this created an unprecedented core of military stability and predictability in Europe. The OSCE Forum for Security Co-operation and the 1994 Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security promoted a new type of relationship among European states based on cooperative approaches to security. The record of implementation of the Vienna Document on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures is improving, with more states providing more complete information on different types of military activity; efforts to address regional, subregional and sub-state confidence- and security-building are gaining momentum. In addition, preventive measures, crisis management and other forms of peace mission are supplementing traditional arms control approaches in shaping the new cooperative regime.

These developments have been accompanied by the spread of a system of common values across Europe. The post-communist states are increasingly adhering to the principles of democracy and political pluralism, market economics and the rule of law. Their commitment to respect international standards in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms has paved the way for the admission of most of these states to the Council of Europe. Many of them also aspire to membership of both NATO and the European Union (EU).

Furthermore, they have made considerable strides towards settling problems in their mutual relations in the form of international treaties. A significant step in this process was the March 1995 signing in Paris of the Pact on Stability in Europe, which was then transmitted by the EU to the OSCE for follow-up and implementation in close cooperation with the Council of Europe.

Clearly, the post-cold war security system is emerging as the result of a host of ad hoc and sometimes contradictory practical steps. While this system could simply be allowed to develop haphazardly, our view is that it is desirable to attempt to shape its framework and to determine its direction. However, it will not evolve according to a single 'master design'; it will emerge gradually through a process of trial and error rather than through the implementation of model-based approaches. Ultimately, the fundamental task is to

effectively manage the risks and meet the challenges of the new security environment in Europe.

## 2. *Risks and challenges*

Since the cold war, there has been a fundamental change in the character of the threats to peace and stability in Europe. Instead of emanating from conflicts *between* states, the most serious security risks emerging in post-cold war Europe stem from conflicts *within* states.

With this change in the 'substance' of security, a broader understanding of the concept of security is needed. The new issues demanding attention include ethnic and religious conflicts as well as environmental degradation, organized crime, terrorism and large-scale population movements. European leaders are addressing these issues. For example, cooperation in preventing and combating international terrorism and crime has become a priority at the regional and subregional level. It is possible to identify an almost endless list of potential or actual security risks and challenges that demand attention. But, if too broadly defined, 'security' begins to lose its meaning as a concept, and it becomes impossible to set priorities for action. The key task is therefore to determine which risks and challenges are of a root character and which are derivative in nature, which are long-term and basic, and which are transitional.

This report identifies four principal categories of risk:

- *The resurfacing of ethnic and religious conflicts* accompanied by the absence of democratic and self-government institutions capable of accommodating the new problems of ethnic, national, religious and language groups. For example, separatist movements exist in a number of countries across Europe, but they are more problematic in those new states where political pluralism and democratic institutions are non-existent or at a very early stage of development.
- *Political instabilities* associated with the transformation of a totalitarian, one party system to a pluralistic democracy based on the rule of law - for example, abuses of power by uncontrolled and unconstrained interest groups and a lack of civil and democratic control of, or limitations on, police powers and the armed forces. Of special concern are the formidable problems facing the newly independent states that have emerged out of the collapse of the old Soviet and Yugoslav multinational federations. These problems are connected with consolidating independence and ensuring stability and are particularly acute because there has been little prior state-building in these countries.

- *Social tensions* stemming from the transformation of a centrally planned economy to a market economy - for example, mass unemployment, erosion of the social safety net and uneven development of regions can give rise to nostalgia for an authoritarian regime which would ensure, even at the lowest level, social welfare, health care and other forms of social protection by the state.
- *Environmental hazards* posed by poorly designed, unsafe nuclear-power facilities and obsolete chemical-manufacturing facilities.

This report identifies five central challenges for participants in the European security system:

- *How to prevent the fragmentation of security in Europe and the subsequent renationalization of security policies* in conditions where there is no single existential threat to Europe. The danger of such a development occurring is already inchoately visible. In this connection there is a pressing need to promote cooperative initiatives at the subregional level, which would help to forestall a permanent division of the continent. Despite the disappearance of the bipolar partition of Europe, its division has not been fully overcome. Europe today remains divided by large social and economic gulfs which threaten to become permanent features of the political landscape.
- *How to manage the international security system in Europe.* It is a challenge for international institutions to develop effective strategies for crisis management, conflict prevention and conflict resolution as well as the mechanisms for implementing them.
- Given that the most serious security risks arise from intra-state conflicts, *how to develop mechanisms that can give early warning of future conflict* and confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) that can address emerging conflicts within states. Ironically, the former Yugoslavia - one of the principal architects of European CSBMs - has become an object lesson in the need for these new measures.
- *How to maintain military-strategic stability in the period of change.* The 'classic threat' associated with armed interstate conflict still figures in the European security equation. Mistrust between neighbouring states can give rise to security anxieties and lead to destabilizing arms races that adversely affect the security environment. A high priority must be given to implementing fully the existing arms control and reduction agreements and confidence-building measures as well as to developing follow-on measures.
- The major reduction in the scale of military expenditure across Europe and North America, combined with the downturn in the volume of global



arms acquisitions, has created adjustment problems for defence industries. In some countries - most notably Russia - these problems have reached crisis proportions. Under these conditions, a fifth challenge is *how to find an effective mechanism for developing a coherent political and strategic approach to managing arms proliferation.*

### 3. Goals and principles

The basis of cold war security was *mutual deterrence*, which reflected the overriding need to prevent any crisis from escalating into general war. The foundation of a new system should be *mutual reassurance*, which requires sovereign states to be able to cooperate on decisions about national security. In other words, the need for a system with the negative goal of preventing a deterioration in security relations has given way to a need for a system which makes a positive and constructive contribution to improving security relations.

A system of cooperative security implies general acceptance of and compliance with binding commitments limiting military capabilities and actions. Instead of mistrust and deterrence, a cooperative system rests on:

- confidence based on openness, transparency and predictability;
- mutual reassurance; and
- legitimacy, which depends on the acceptance by members that the military constraints of the regime substantially ensure their security.

The establishment of a shared 'rule book' of fundamental norms and principles governing the domestic and international behaviour of states is a prerequisite for creating a cooperative security system. What should the basic rules of that system be?

This report is not an attempt to suggest a revision of the principles of the Helsinki Final Act, which would open a Pandora's box. However, the time is ripe to go beyond general political declarations, such as those set out in the 1994 Budapest Summit Declaration, that a future security model should be based upon the concepts of common, comprehensive and cooperative security. These adjectives are perhaps better understood as criteria which the new security system should meet rather than as its guiding principles.

The concept of *cooperative* security should, if possible, fulfil the following criteria:

- *Comprehensiveness*, defined as acknowledgement of the link between the maintenance of peace and the respect for human rights and fundamental

freedoms as well as economic, cultural, legal and environmental cooperation;

- *Indivisibility*, which demands a common effort in pursuing, security interests, as the security of each state or group of states is inseparably linked to that of all others; and
- *A cooperative approach*, as embodied in existing complementary and mutually reinforcing institutions, including European and transatlantic organizations, multilateral and bilateral undertakings, and various forms of regional and subregional cooperation.

There is a need to *supplement* the principles of the Helsinki Final Act with:

- a commitment to democracy in connection with security, as defined in the 1990 Charter of Paris for a New Europe, and
- the right to what might be called 'cooperative intervention', under the authority of the United Nations Security Council and the OSCE as a European regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the UN Charter.

In addition, the interrelationship between the existing principles of sovereignty and non-intervention should be reinterpreted or redefined in the light of a new principle that of *solidarity*, as reflected in the 1994 Code of Conduct. The international community has a right and an obligation to protect populations deprived of basic human rights or subjected to large-scale violence in domestic conflicts.

A second key interrelationship that needs to be redefined in the light of the fundamental changes that have taken place in Europe is that between the principle of state integrity and the right to self-determination. The right to self-determination cannot merely be reduced to the right to secession or the right to independent statehood. *The internal right to self-determination* should be defined as respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the right to build, consolidate and strengthen the rule of law and the pluralistic character of democracy as the only accepted system of government of nations. The right to self-determination has to be balanced by the rights to state sovereignty and territorial integrity with safe and secure borders and the right to international peace and security.

#### *4. What kind of institutions and for what?*

The basic institutional elements of the post-cold war security system emerging in Europe are already in place (the Council of Europe, the European Un-

ion/WEU, NATO and the OSCE). However, these institutions were created under the framework of the old security system and do not work well in the new environment. They have often been conspicuously unequal to the urgent challenges of crisis management, conflict prevention and conflict resolution. The adaptation of existing institutions to the new security environment will be a gradual process. It is becoming clear that no single institution is likely to acquire competence to deal with all aspects of security. The goal should be to promote synergy and harmony between institutions. Some overlapping of functions between institutions must not be seen as always having a debilitating effect.

A new concept that is gradually taking hold is that the international community should pursue an order without a hierarchy, based on the self-regulation and self-organization of states. The concept of order without hierarchy raises the practical problem of how to respond when one or more states disobey the rules. This will be the responsibility of nation-states working in partnership through international institutions. While the specific response would have to be tailored to the nature of the transgression, the general approach would be for the subset of states with interests directly at stake to accept responsibility.

#### *Improving the functions of institutions*

##### *Crisis response*

Two measures would increase the efficiency of decision making in a crisis.

*First*, international institutions should be given the mandate to act not only as a secretariat for meetings, but also as a convenor of meetings. The president, the chairman (depending on the specific institution) or the head of the secretariat should take an initiative to invite member states to address a crisis immediately on its occurrence. However, the invitations should be issued on an ad hoc basis and addressed to the group of interested states rather than to all members. Only those governments which have the specific interest and capacity which are needed in managing the crisis should be invited. This capacity need not be military. It might reflect political or economic factors or it might be a function of geography.

It should be stressed that the obligation would be to arrange a meeting and invite participants. The institution would play no role in deciding the subsequent course of action (if any) to be taken.

*Second*, there should be formal mechanisms through which full information about both the decisions taken and the arguments which were used to support the chosen course of action is made available to legal and recognized opposition parties in member states. At present, there is a danger that international institutions can reduce the efficiency of decision making since governments

can use the institution as an 'alibi' to avoid taking a decision. International institutions should cease to be a club for *governments* and should become instead a forum for *state policy*.

#### *Military-related export controls*

At present, the effort to find a normative balance between the political, strategic and defence industrial aspects of arms transfers is being undertaken in the newly created Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies. While the Wassenaar Arrangement includes many European countries, it is not exclusively European. In this sense Wassenaar is a good example of a flexible and target-oriented policy instrument. However, the first discussions have underlined how little policy coherence there is among suppliers on the approach to arms transfers and arms transfer control. Neither is it likely that a core of European states could make progress towards a harmonized policy since some of the most fundamental disagreements are between the members of the European Union. On this issue there would therefore be no point in duplicating the activities of the Wassenaar Arrangement in the framework of an exclusively European institution.

This does not mean that there are no useful tasks which European institutions can perform in the area of arms transfers. In fact, this issue is already on the agendas of the European Union and the OSCE. However, these activities—useful as they are—relate to technical and procedural questions. Neither the role of arms transfers in international security nor the proscribed destinations and the criteria by which they should be identified are yet adequately elaborated.

#### *Transformation of NATO*

A key challenge now is how to enlarge NATO in a cooperative, non-confrontational way that does not foment new antagonisms and divisions. A compromise needs to be reached with Russia that will reassure it that its interests are considered and that it remains an important international actor.

With regard to the enlargement of NATO, Russia, Ukraine and the Baltic states should concentrate on developing a strategic partnership with the alliance. The special relationships may be based on the 1949 Washington Treaty provisions, adapted to the specific circumstances of each.

At the same time, direct military-to-military cooperation should foster a gradual accommodation that could form the basis for a comprehensive political structure over the long term.

In undertaking new military tasks, NATO's June 1996 decision to establish Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) will go some way towards providing a framework for action by European countries, regardless of their membership in security structures.

#### *Transformation of the EU*

The European Union has to assume greater responsibility for its and Europe's security. In spite of the often repeated assertion that the balance between military and non-military factors in European security has changed, the EU has not yet formulated a common foreign and security policy (CFSP). This should be decided by the Intergovernmental Conference and will require Britain, France and Germany to reconcile their competing visions of the future role of the EU in the European security system.

The Western European Union (WEU) has taken concrete organizational steps to improve the performance of tasks identified in the 1992 Petersberg Declaration. However, further steps will be conditional on the decisions on a common foreign and security policy.

Enlargement of the EU by admitting the new democratic states would consolidate security in Europe and help the new members address non-military security risks.

#### *The Commonwealth of Independent States*

The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) plays an important role as a mechanism for furthering economic cooperation among its member states. It could also make a significant contribution in stabilizing the security situation on the territory of the former Soviet Union, assuming that relations within the CIS are based on respect for the principles of sovereign equality and common democratic values. To avoid the emergence of a new bloc-to-bloc confrontation, Western institutions and governments should interact more energetically with the CIS and draw it into constructive pan-European cooperation.

#### *The OSCE*

The OSCE can make a significant contribution to the emerging security system. Its capabilities contribute especially to conflict prevention and crisis management. Promising OSCE instruments, such as the High Commissioner on National Minorities and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, should be developed further and establish joint ventures with the Council of Europe.

The OSCE already provides an opportunity for a focused dialogue, transparency and information exchanges between states that can serve to reassure governments.

The OSCE is, however, structurally incapable of serving as the primary security institution of a future European security system. Given that fact, excessive bureaucratization of the organization to no purpose—for example, by creating a host of new institutions—should be avoided and reliance placed on ad hoc bodies and arrangements instead.

### *The Council of Europe*

The concept of democratic security was launched by the Council of Europe at its 1993 Vienna Summit Meeting. It has two parts: the insistence on pluralistic democracy, the rule of law and the respect for human rights as fundamental preconditions for security; and European cooperation based on these values. Enlargement of membership of the Council of Europe in itself contributed to the establishment of a large space of democratic security. All the new member states have committed themselves to bring their institutions and legal systems into line with the basic principles and internationally recognized standards of democracy. The solidarity principle is inherent in the concept of democratic security.

### *5. Conclusions*

This report leads to the following general conclusions:

- *The indivisibility of security* is a goal to which Europe should aspire. While it may be unrealistic to expect that all states will feel equally secure, nevertheless the aim should be the widest possible acceptance of what has proved to be best practice.
- *Three basic rules* should be included in a security agenda:
  - each state must still be responsible for its own security, even if it belongs to an alliance;
  - security problems should be addressed according to the principle of subsidiarity, that is, where feasible, be dealt with on the subregional or regional level; and
  - there must be solidarity between states with regard to security issues.
- *There is a need to build domestic support for the changes and arrangements that are under way.* Domestic support for extending or deepening the existing institutions is likely to dwindle rather than increase, in part because of the geopolitical changes (the structures existing today derive

from the former era) and in part because of generational changes which naturally weaken popular commitment to existing institutions.

- *There is an urgent need for the Western countries to enter into a dialogue about security-related issues with Russia, Ukraine and the Baltic states.* Russia needs to be reassured that its views are being heard and taken seriously, and it should listen attentively to international concerns about its behaviour. The security concerns of Ukraine and the Baltic states should also be duly taken into account. NATO enlargement should not be allowed to lead to new divisions or destabilization, nor should it provoke Russia or compromise the independence of Ukraine and the Baltic states.
- *The geopolitical organization of Europe needs more attention.* Enlargement of NATO and the EU would overcome the historical tendency for Central Europe to be either a region in which armed conflicts erupt and tend to radiate outward or the point of collision between adversaries from east and west. However, if the Atlantic community is extended to the east, based on the concept of inclusiveness, this must be accompanied by an offer to Russia and its western neighbours of a new cooperative arrangement. In this context the proposal that the nuclear weapon states commit themselves not to deploy nuclear weapons in Eastern and Central Europe deserves serious consideration.
- *Institutions should follow the problems.* More attention should be paid to the content and volume of cooperation between institutions than to their structures.
- *No single organization can handle all the security problems.* The goal, therefore, is to promote synergy and harmony between institutions. Some overlapping of functions between institutions must not be seen as always having a debilitating effect. The general capabilities of institutions should be assessed to determine where their comparative advantages lie.
- *Europe must engage the countries of its adjacent regions* (North Africa, the Middle East and the Central Asian republics), which are fraught with tensions and which pose potential security problems; it must consider what can be done to structure a meaningful dialogue with the countries in these regions.

#### *Recommendations*

The search for comprehensive and cooperative security for the 21st century in Europe should:

- *Go beyond existing frameworks* and suggest directions in which multilateral efforts towards security should be aimed.

- *Define a more systematic approach* to preventing and resolving conflicts. This should be based on a review of the underlying goals and principles; on the study, discussion and consideration of the roles of states and organizations; and on the development of better techniques for conflict prevention; and it should provide stronger support by governments for institutions that are performing work in this field.
- *Allow for the enlargement of Western institutions*, including differentiated types of membership in order to meet the objective of non-threatening and cooperative enlargement.
- *Rebalance and reapportion security responsibilities in the OSCE area* so that each player understands and accepts not only its own role but also the role of the other players.

Organizations and institutions should be prepared to consider new types of relationship with non-member states, including association, treaty relationships and other means of outreach to open a dialogue with countries from the regions which are adjacent to Europe.



## Forms and Fora of Co-operation in the OSCE Area

G-7/ G-8 (Group of Seven/Eight)<sup>1</sup>

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

Council of Europe

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)<sup>2</sup>

EAPC Observer

Partnership for Peace (PfP)

NATO-Russia-Founding Act<sup>3</sup>

NATO-Ukraine-Charta<sup>4</sup>

European Union (EU)

EU Association Agreement

European Free Trade Area (EFTA)

Western European Union (WEU)

Associate Member of the WEU<sup>5</sup>

Associate Partner of the WEU<sup>6</sup>

WEU Observer

Eurocorps

Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

Baltic Defense Council

Barents Euro-Arctic Council

Nordic Council

Council of the Baltic Sea States

---

<sup>1</sup> The Heads of State or Government of the seven leading industrial countries (G-7) and Russia met for the first time on 20 June 1997 in Denver as Summit of Eight (G-8).

<sup>2</sup> At the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Sintra/Portugal on 30 May 1997 the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) was founded as the successor organization of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. The EAPC held its first meeting on 9 July 1997 in Madrid.

<sup>3</sup> In the "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation" of 27 May 1997 NATO and Russia agreed on establishing the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council which met for the first time on 18 July 1997.

<sup>4</sup> During the NATO Summit in Madrid on 9 July 1997 the Heads of State or Government of the 16 NATO States and Ukrainian President Kuchma signed the "Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Ukraine".

<sup>5</sup> The NATO States Iceland, Norway and Turkey joined the WEU as Associate Members. In WEU-practice no difference is made between associate and full members.

<sup>6</sup> The EU countries Ireland, Finland, Austria and Sweden which are not members of NATO have observer status which, however, is confined to information exchange, presence in meetings in individual cases and on invitation.

Central European Free Trade Area (CEFTA)

Visegrád Group

Central European Initiative (CEI)

South European Cooperation Initiative (SECI)

Black Sea Economic Cooperation

North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA)

## The 55 OSCE Participating States - Facts and Figures\*

### 1. Albania

*Date of Accession:* June 1991

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 28,748 km<sup>2</sup> (OSCE Ranking: 45)

*Population:* 3,414,000<sup>1</sup> (OSCE Ranking: 42)

*GNP per Capita:* 360 \$<sup>2</sup> (OSCE Ranking: 50)

*Armed Forces (Active):* 54,000<sup>3</sup> (OSCE Ranking: 27)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, Black Sea Economic Cooperation, SECI

### 2. Andorra

*Date of Accession:* April 1996

*Scale of Distribution:* was not fixed at time of printing

*Area:* 467.76 km<sup>2</sup> (50)

*Population:* 64,000 (51)

*GNP per Capita:* 21,150 \$<sup>4</sup> (14)

*Armed Forces:* None

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe

### 3. Armenia

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.185 per cent

*Area:* 29,800 km<sup>2</sup> (44)

*Population:* 3,773,000 (38)

*GNP per Capita:* 670 \$ (46)

*Armed Forces:* 57,400 (24)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

### 4. Austria

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 2.05 per cent

*Area:* 83,858 km<sup>2</sup> (29)

---

\* Drawn up by Matthias Z. Karádi

<sup>1</sup> See Fischer Weltalmanach 1997. The figures refer to 1995.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> See International Institute for Strategic Studies, Military Balance 1996/1997. The issue contains the data of 1 August 1996.

<sup>4</sup> See Fischer Weltalmanach 1996. The figures refer to 1994.

*Population:* 8,030,000 (25)

*GNP per Capita:* 24,950 \$ (7)

*Armed Forces:* 55,800 (25)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, EAPC Observer, Partnership for Peace, EU, WEU Observer, CEI

## **5. Azerbaijan**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.185 per cent

*Area:* 86,600 km<sup>2</sup> (28)

*Population:* 7,472,000 (26)

*GNP per Capita:* 500 \$ (49)

*Armed Forces:* 70,700 (17)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

## **6. Belarus**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.7 per cent

*Area:* 207,595 km<sup>2</sup> (19)

*Population:* 10,163,000 (19)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,160 \$ (35)

*Armed Forces:* 85,500 (16)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS

## **7. Belgium**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 3.55 per cent

*Area:* 30,528 km<sup>2</sup> (43)

*Population:* 10,080,000 (21)

*GNP per Capita:* 22,920 \$ (12)

*Armed Forces:* 46,300 (28)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU, Eurocorps

## **8. Bosnia and Herzegovina**

*Date of Accession:* April 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 51,129 km<sup>2</sup> (36)

*Population:* 3,500,000 (41)

*GNP per Capita:* 350 \$ (51)

*Armed Forces:* 92,000 (Muslim-Croat Federation) (15); 85,000 (Serb

Republic);

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* CEI, SECI

## **9. Bulgaria**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.55 per cent

*Area:* 110,994 km<sup>2</sup> (23)

*Population:* 8,818,000 (23)

*GNP per Capita:* 1,160 \$ (40)

*Armed Forces:* 103,500 (14)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, SECI, Black Sea Economic Cooperation,

## **10. Canada**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 5.45 per cent

*Area:* 9,958,319 km<sup>2</sup> (2)

*Population:* 29,121,000 (11)

*GNP per Capita:* 19,570 \$ (15)

*Armed Forces:* 70,500 (18)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* G-7/G-8, OECD, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, NAFTA

## **11. Croatia**

*Date of Accession:* March 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 56,538 km<sup>2</sup> (35)

*Population:* 4,780,000 (33)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,530 \$ (30)

*Armed Forces:* 64,700 (20)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, CEI, SECI

## **12. Cyprus**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 9,251 km<sup>2</sup> (48)

*Population:* 734,000 (47)

*GNP per Capita:* 10,380 \$ (21)

*Armed Forces:* 10,000 (39)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, EU Association Agreement

### **13. Czech Republic**

*Date of Accession:* January 1993

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.67 per cent

*Area:* 78,864 km<sup>2</sup> (30)

*Population:* 10,295,000 (18)

*GNP per Capita:* 3,210 \$ (27)

*Armed Forces:* 70,000 (19)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, CEFTA, Visegrád Group, CEI

### **14. Denmark**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 2.05 per cent

*Area:* 43,094 km<sup>2</sup> (39)

*Population:* 5,173,000 (31)

*GNP per Capita:* 28,110 \$ (4)

*Armed Forces:* 32,900 (31)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU Observer, Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States

### **15. Estonia**

*Date of Accession:* September 1991

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 45,227 km<sup>2</sup> (38)

*Population:* 1,541,000 (46)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,820 \$ (28)

*Armed Forces:* 3,450 (45)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, Baltic Defense Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States

### **16. Finland**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 2.05 per cent

*Area:* 338,139 km<sup>2</sup> (13)

*Population:* 5,083,000 (32)

*GNP per Capita:* 18,850 \$ (17)

*Armed Forces:* 32,500 (32)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, EAPC Observer, Partnership for Peace, EU, WEU Observer, Barents Euro-Arctic

Council, Nordic Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States,

### **17. France**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 9.0 per cent

*Area:* 543,965 km<sup>2</sup> (7)

*Population:* 57,726,000 (6)

*GNP per Capita:* 23,470 \$ (11)

*Armed Forces:* 398,900 (5)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* G-7/G-8, OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU, Eurocorps

### **18. Georgia**

*Date of Accession:* March 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.185 per cent

*Area:* 69,700 km<sup>2</sup> (32)

*Population:* 5,450,000 (29)

*GNP per Capita:* 580 \$ (48)

*Armed Forces:* no data given (9,000 Military Balance 1995-1996)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

### **19. Germany**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 9.0 per cent

*Area:* 356,854 km<sup>2</sup> (12)

*Population:* 81,538,603 (3)

*GNP per Capita:* 25,580 \$ (6)

*Armed Forces:* 358,400 (6)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* G-7/G-8, OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU, Eurocorps, Council of the Baltic Sea States

### **20. Greece**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.7 per cent

*Area:* 131,957 km<sup>2</sup> (22)

*Population:* 10,408,000 (17)

*GNP per Capita:* 7,710 \$ (24)

*Armed Forces:* 168,300 (12)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU, SECI, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

## **21. The Holy See**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.15 per cent

*Area:* 0.44 km<sup>2</sup> (55)

*Population:* 802 (55)

*GNP per Capita:* no data given

*Armed Forces:* None

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* -

## **22. Hungary**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.7 per cent

*Area:* 93,030 km<sup>2</sup> (26)

*Population:* 10,161,000 (20)

*GNP per Capita:* 3,840 \$ (26)

*Armed Forces:* 64,300 (21)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, CEFTA, Visegrád Group, CEI, SECI

## **23. Iceland**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 103,000 km<sup>2</sup> (24)

*Population:* 266,000 (50)

*GNP per Capita:* 24,590 \$ (9)

*Armed Forces:* None

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EFTA, Associate Member of the WEU, Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council

## **24. Ireland**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.55 per cent

*Area:* 70,283 km<sup>2</sup> (31)

*Population:* 3,543,000 (40)

*GNP per Capita:* 13,630 \$ (19)

*Armed Forces:* 12,700 (36)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, EU, WEU Observer



## **25. Italy**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 9.0 per cent

*Area:* 301,302 km<sup>2</sup> (16)

*Population:* 57,154,000 (7)

*GNP per Capita:* 19,270 \$ (16)

*Armed Forces:* 325,150 (7)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* G-7/G-8, OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU, CEI

## **26. Kazakhstan**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.55 per cent

*Area:* 2,717,300 km<sup>2</sup> (4)

*Population:* 17,027,000 (14)

*GNP per Capita:* 1,110 \$ (41)

*Armed Forces:* 40,000 (30)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS

## **27. Kyrgyzstan**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.185 per cent

*Area:* 198,500 km<sup>2</sup> (20)

*Population:* 4,667,000 (34)

*GNP per Capita:* 610 \$ (47)

*Armed Forces:* 7,000 (42)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS

## **28. Latvia**

*Date of Accession:* September 1991

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 64,589 km<sup>2</sup> (34)

*Population:* 2,583,000 (43)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,290 \$ (33)

*Armed Forces:* 8,000 (41)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, Baltic Defense Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States

## **29. Liechtenstein**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.15 per cent

*Area:* 160 km<sup>2</sup> (52)

*Population:* 30,629 (53)

*GNP per Capita:* 30,270 \$<sup>5</sup> (3)

*Armed Forces:* None

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Since 1923 Community of Law, Economy and Currency with Switzerland (Cf. Switzerland), Council of Europe, EFTA

### **30. Lithuania**

*Date of Accession:* September 1991

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 65,300 km<sup>2</sup> (33)

*Population:* 3,706,000 (39)

*GNP per Capita:* 1,350 \$ (38)

*Armed Forces:* 5,100 (44)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, Baltic Defense Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States

### **31. Luxembourg**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.55 per cent

*Area:* 2,586 km<sup>2</sup> (49)

*Population:* 400,900 (48)

*GNP per Capita:* 39,850 \$ (1)

*Armed Forces:* 800 (48)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU, Eurocorps

---

<sup>5</sup> See Fischer Weltalmanach 1996. The figures refer to 1994.

### **32. Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of**

*Date of Accession:* October 1995

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 25,713 km<sup>2</sup> (46)

*Population:* 2,093,000 (44)

*GNP per Capita:* 790 \$ (45)

*Armed Forces:* 10,400 (38)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CEI, SECI

### **33. Malta**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.15 per cent

*Area:* 315.6 km<sup>2</sup> (51)

*Population:* 364,000 (49)

*GNP per Capita:* 7,970 \$ (23)

*Armed Forces:* 1,950 (47)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, EU Association Agreement

### **34. Moldova**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 33,700 km<sup>2</sup> (42)

*Population:* 4,420,000 (35)

*GNP per Capita:* 870 \$ (44)

*Armed Forces:* 11,900 (37)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS, SECI, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

### **35. Monaco**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.15 per cent

*Area:* 1.95 km<sup>2</sup> (54)

*Population:* 32,000 (52)

*GNP per Capita:* no data available

*Armed Forces:* None

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* -

### **36. Netherlands**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 3.55 per cent

*Area:* 41,864 km<sup>2</sup> (40)

*Population:* 15,391,000 (15)

*GNP per Capita:* 21,970 \$ (13)

*Armed Forces:* 63,100 (22)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU

### **37. Norway**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 2.05 per cent

*Area:* 323,877 km<sup>2</sup> (14)

*Population:* 4,318,000 (36)

*GNP per Capita:* 26,480 \$ (5)

*Armed Forces:* 30,000 (33)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EFTA, Associate Member of the WEU, Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States

### **38. Poland**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 1.4 per cent

*Area:* 312,685 km<sup>2</sup> (15)

*Population:* 38,341,000 (10)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,470 \$ (31)

*Armed Forces:* 248,500 (8)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, Council of the Baltic Sea States, CEFTA, Visegrád Group, CEI

### **39. Portugal**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.55 per cent

*Area:* 92,389 km<sup>2</sup> (27)

*Population:* 9,832,000 (22)

*GNP per Capita:* 9,370 \$ (22)

*Armed Forces:* 54,200 (26)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU

#### **40. Romania**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.7 per cent

*Area:* 237,500 km<sup>2</sup> (18)

*Population:* 22,736,000 (12)

*GNP per Capita:* 1,230 \$ (39)

*Armed Forces:* 228,400 (9)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, CEFTA, SECI, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

#### **41. Russian Federation\***

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 9.0 per cent

*Area:* 17,075,400 km<sup>2</sup> (1)

*Population:* 148,366,000 (2)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,650 \$ (29)

*Armed Forces:* 1,270,000 (2)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* G-8, Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, NATO-Russia-Founding Act/NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, CIS, Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

\* Russia is the legal successor of the USSR in the OSCE

#### **42. San Marino**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.15 per cent

*Area:* 60.57 km<sup>2</sup> (53)

*Population:* 24,335 (54)

*GNP per Capita:* no data given

*Armed Forces:* None

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe

#### **43. Slovakia**

*Date of Accession:* January 1993

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.33 per cent

*Area:* 49,035 km<sup>2</sup> (36)

*Population:* 5,333,000 (30)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,230 \$ (34)

*Armed Forces:* 42,600 (29)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, CEFTA, Visegrád Group, CEI

#### **44. Slovenia**

*Date of Accession:* March 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.19 per cent

*Area:* 20,254 km<sup>2</sup> (47)

*Population:* 1,995,000 (45)

*GNP per Capita:* 7,140 \$ (25)

*Armed Forces:* 9,550 (40)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, EU Association Agreement, Associate Partner of the WEU, CEFTA, CEI, SECI

#### **45. Spain**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 3.65 per cent

*Area:* 504,782 km<sup>2</sup> (8)

*Population:* 39,551,000 (9)

*GNP per Capita:* 13,280 \$ (20)

*Armed Forces:* 206,800 (11)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU, Eurocorps

#### **46. Sweden**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 3.55 per cent

*Area:* 449,964 km<sup>2</sup> (10)

*Population:* 8,735,000 (24)

*GNP per Capita:* 23,630 \$ (10)

*Armed Forces:* 62,600 (23)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, EAPC Observer, Partnership for Peace, EU, WEU Observer, Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States

#### **47. Switzerland**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 2.3 per cent

*Area:* 41,284 km<sup>2</sup> (41)

*Population:* 7,019,019 (27)

*GNP per Capita:* 37,180 \$ (2)

*Armed Forces:* 3,300 (46)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD, Council of Europe, Partnership for Peace

#### **48. Tajikistan**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.185 per cent

*Area:* 143,100 km<sup>2</sup> (21)

*Population:* 5,933,000 (28)

*GNP per Capita:* 350 \$ (52)

*Armed Forces:* 5,000 - 7,000 (43)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, CIS

#### **49. Turkey**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 1.0 per cent

*Area:* 779,452 km<sup>2</sup> (5)

*Population:* 60,771,000 (4)

*GNP per Capita:* 2,450 \$ (32)

*Armed Forces:* 639,000 (3)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* OECD Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU Association Agreement, Associate Member of the WEU, SECI, Black Sea Economic Cooperation

#### **50. Turkmenistan**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.185 per cent

*Area:* 488,100 km<sup>2</sup> (9)

*Population:* 4,010,000 (37)

*GNP per Capita:* 1,390 \$ (37)

*Armed Forces:* 17,000 (35)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS

## **51. Ukraine**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 1.75 per cent

*Area:* 603,700 km<sup>2</sup> (6)

*Population:* 51,465,000 (8)

*GNP per Capita:* 1,570 \$ (36)

*Armed Forces:* 400,800 (4)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Council of Europe, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, NATO-Ukraine-Charta, CIS, Black Sea Economic Cooperation,

## **52. United Kingdom**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 9.0 per cent

*Area:* 242,429 km<sup>2</sup> (17)

*Population:* 58,088,000 (5)

*GNP per Capita:* 18,410 \$ (18)

*Armed Forces:* 226,000 (10)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* G-7/G-8, OECD, Council of Europe, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, EU, WEU

## **53. USA**

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 9.0 per cent

*Area:* 9,372,614 km<sup>2</sup> (3)

*Population:* 260,529,000 (1)

*GNP per Capita:* 25,860 \$ (5)

*Armed Forces:* 1,483,800 (1)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* G-7/G-8, OECD, NATO, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, NAFTA,

## **54. Uzbekistan**

*Date of Accession:* January 1992

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.55 per cent

*Area:* 447,400 km<sup>2</sup> (11)

*Population:* 22,349,000 (13)

*GNP per Capita:* 950 \$ (42)

*Armed Forces:* 29,000 (34)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Partnership for Peace, CIS



**55. Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)\*\***

*Date of Accession:* November 1972

*Scale of Distribution:* 0.55 per cent

*Area:* 102,173 km<sup>2</sup> (25)

*Population:* 10,707,000 (16)

*GNP per Capita:* 900 \$ (43)

*Armed Forces:* 113,900 (13)

*Memberships and Forms of Co-operation:* suspended

\*\* On 8 July 1992 the CSCE decided to suspend the participation of Yugoslavia in the CSCE.

*Sources:* Fischer Weltalmanach '97. Zahlen Daten Fakten, Frankfurt/M. 1996; International Institute for Strategic Studies, The Military Balance 1996-1997, London 1996; Uwe Andersen/Wichard Woyke (Eds.), Handwörterbuch Internationale Organisationen, Opladen 1995; Hans-Joachim Gießmann/Ursel Schlichting (Eds.), Handbuch Sicherheit. Militär und Sicherheit in Mittel- und Osteuropa, Baden-Baden 1995; OSCE Handbook 1996, Vienna 1996.



## OSCE Seminars and Conferences 1996/1997

### 1996

25-26 September	Seminar on a Framework for Private Sector Development, Industrial Co-operation and Direct Investments in the CIS Countries, Minsk.
4-5 October	Round Table on the Role of the Media in the Transition to Democracy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
11-13 October	Follow-up Meeting to the Bizovac Round Table on Certain Post-UNTAES Issues, Trakoscan, Croatia.
20-24 October	Training programme for NGOs, Chisinau, Moldova.
30 October	First Round Table Meeting of the European Business Council, Vienna.
4-22 November	OSCE biennial Review Meeting, Vienna.
11-13 November	Workshop on "The Role of the Judiciary in a State Governed by the Rule of Law", Baku, Azerbaijan.
25-29 November	Preparatory Meeting for the Lisbon Summit, Lisbon.
2-3 December	OSCE Summit Meeting, Lisbon.
5-6 December	Workshop on Legal Education Clinics, Cracow, Poland.
8-9 December	Round Table on Kazakhstan: Building a Multicultural and Multiethnic Society on the Eve of the 21st Century, Lorcarno.
11-12 December	Forum for Judges from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Tuzla.

### 1997

13-15 January	Seminar on Parliamentarianism and Democracy (Hosted by the Austrian Parliament and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly), Vienna.
16-17 January	Meeting of the Standing Committee of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Vienna.
24 January	High-Level Tripartite Meeting between representatives of Geneva-based United Nations organizations, the Council of Europe and the OSCE, under participation of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Organization for Migration, Geneva.
4 February	"2+2 Meeting" between representatives of the OSCE and the Council of Europe, Oslo.
12-13 February	Seminar on Regional and Bilateral Confidence and Security Building and Open Skies, Sarajevo.

13-14 February	ODIHR Election Observation Review Meeting, Warsaw.
3-5 March	Seventh Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM 1997) of the Forum for Security Co-operation, Vienna.
22 March	Conference on Prevention of Violence and Discrimination Against Roma in Europe, Bucharest.
8-11 April	Human Dimension Seminar on Election Administration and Election Observation, Warsaw.
14-16 April	Rule of Law Seminar "The Prosecutor in Changing Legal Systems", Dushanbe, Tajikistan.
17-18 April	Seminar on Women in Public Life - Regional Consultation in Central Asia, Dushanbe, Tajikistan.
18 April	Meeting of the Contact Group with the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation on "Military Aspects of Security: How to Promote CSBMs", Vienna.
26-27 April	Meeting of OSCE/ODIHR experts on Freedom of Religion, Warsaw.
6-7 May	Seminar on Specific Risks and Challenges, Vienna.
8-10 May	Meeting of journalists from Tbilisi and Sukhumi (organized by ODIHR and the OSCE Mission to Georgia), Warsaw.
20-21 May	Working consultation on the practical aspects of future co-operation on Roma and Sinti issues between the OSCE and the Council of Europe, Helsinki.
2-4 June	Seminar on Regional Security and Co-operation, Vienna.
2-6, June	Fourth Annual Warsaw Judicial Symposium, Warsaw.
11-13 June	Fifth OSCE Economic Forum, Prague.
5-8 July	Sixth Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Warsaw.
3-5 September	Mediterranean Seminar "The Security Model for the Twenty-first Century: Implications for the Mediterranean Basin", Cairo.
22-24 September	First Follow-up Conference on the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, Vienna.
22-25 September	OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Expanded Bureau Meeting and Parliamentary Seminar on "Regional Security and Political, Economic, Social and Humanitarian Issues in Central Asia and the Caucasus", Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
29-30 September	Seminar on Co-operation among International Organizations and Institutions: the Bosnia and Herzegovina Experience, Portoroz, Slovenia.
8 October	Parliamentary Conference on Sub-regional Co-operation Processes, Monaco.

- 14-17 October ODIHR Human Dimension Seminar on the Promotion of Women's Participation in Society, Warsaw.
- 22-23 October Seminar on the Role of Economic Legislation for Social and Economic Transition, Almaty, Kazakhstan.
- 30 October Seminar "Promoting Sustainable Development in the Aral Sea Region", Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
- 13-28 November Implementation Meeting on Human Dimension Issues, Warsaw.



Matthias Z. Karádi

## OSCE Selected Bibliography

### *Documents and Bibliographies*

- Bloed, Arie (Ed.)*, The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Basic Documents, 1993-1995, The Hague/London/Boston 1997.
- Foundation on Inter-Ethnic Relations (Ed.)*, Bibliography on the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. Documents, Speeches and Related Publications, The Hague 1997.
- Höynck, Wilhelm*, From CSCE to OSCE: statements and speeches of Dr. Wilhelm Höynck, Secretary General of the OSCE (1993-1996), Vienna 1996.
- International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights*, Annual Report, Vienna 1997.
- Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights*, From Budapest to Lisbon: Review of Activities of the ODIHR, November 1994 - November 1996, Warsaw 1996.
- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe*, A Chronology of 21 Years, London 1997.
- Rotfeld, Adam Daniel*, From Helsinki to Budapest and Beyond: Analysis and Documents of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, 1973-1995, Oxford 1996.

### *Books*

- Algieri, Franco/Josef Janning/Dirk Rumberg (Eds.)*, Managing Security in Europe, Gütersloh 1996.
- Bertram, Christoph*, Europa in der Schwebe. Der Frieden muß noch gewonnen werden, Bonn 1997.
- Bertram, Christoph*, Europe in the Balance: Securing the Peace Won in the Cold War, Washington D.C. 1995.
- Birmingham, K.*, The OSCE and Minority Issues, The Hague 1995.
- Borawski, John*, A Better Peace: The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Tampere 1995.
- Bortloff, Jens*, Die Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa. Eine völkerrechtliche Bestandsaufnahme, Berlin 1996.
- Carlson, Staffan (Ed.)*, The Challenge of Preventive Diplomacy. The Experience of the CSCE, Stockholm 1994.

- Chayes, Abram/Antonia Handler (Eds.)*, Preventing Conflict in the Post-Communist World. Mobilizing International and Regional Organizations, Washington D.C. 1996.
- Ghebali, Victor-Yves*, L'OSCE dans l'Europe post-communiste, 1990-1996. Vers une identité paneuropéenne de sécurité, Brussels 1996.
- Groll, Götz von/Berthold Meyer*, Noch eine Chance für den Verhandlungsfrieden. Lehren aus der KSZE für eine Konferenz über Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit im Nahen Osten, HSFK-Report 7/1996, Frankfurt/Main 1996.
- Holstein, Alexia*, Das Verhältnis des Sicherheitsrates der Vereinten Nationen zu NATO und OSZE, Stuttgart/Munich 1996.
- Hong, Ki-Joon*, The CSCE Security Regime Formation: An Asian Perspective, London 1997.
- Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik an der Universität Hamburg/IFSH (Ed.)*, OSZE-Jahrbuch 1996, Baden-Baden 1996.
- Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (Ed.)*, OSCE Yearbook 1995/1996, Baden-Baden 1997.
- Kemp, Walter*, The OSCE in a New Context. European Security towards the 21st Century, London 1996.
- Klein, Eckhart (Ed.)*, The Institution of a Commissioner for Human Rights and Minorities and the Prevention of Human Rights Violations, Berlin 1995.
- Lutz, Dieter S.*, The OSCE - Foundation of the European Security Structure, Basis of the European Security Zone, Hamburger Informationen zur Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik 19/1996, Hamburg 1996.
- Mandelbaum, Michael*, The Dawn of Peace in Europe, New York 1996.
- Nooy, Gert de (Ed.)*, Cooperative Security, the OSCE and its Code of Conduct, The Hague 1996.
- Peters, Ingo (Ed.)*, New Security Challenges: The Adaption of International Institutions, Münster 1996.
- Ramelot, Vincent/Eric Remacle*, L'OSCE et les conflits en Europe, Brussels 1995.
- Renk, Hans-Jörg*, Der Weg der Schweiz nach Helsinki. Der Beitrag der schweizerischen Diplomatie zum Zustandekommen der Konferenz über Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa (KSZE) 1972-1975, Bern/Stuttgart 1996.
- Rohde-Liebenau, Sylvia*, Menschenrechte und internationaler Wandel. Der Einfluß des KSZE-Menschenrechtsregimes auf den Wandel des internationalen Systems in Europa, Baden-Baden 1996.
- Schneider, Heinrich*, Europäische Sicherheitsarchitektur - Konzeptionen und Realitäten, Frankfurt/Main 1996.
- Senghaas, Dieter (Ed.)*, Frieden machen, Frankfurt/Main 1997.
- Steglich, Peter/Günter Leuschner*, KSZE - Fossil oder Hoffnung?, mit einem Vorwort von Egon Bahr, Berlin 1996.



- Switalski, Piotr*, The OSCE in the European Security System: Changes and Limits, Center for International Relations at the Institute of Public Affairs, Warsaw 1997.
- Szonyi, István*, Alternative Futures for the OSCE, Hungarian Institute of International Affairs, Budapest 1996.
- Tudyka, Kurt P.*, Das OSZE-Handbuch. Die Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit von Vancouver bis Wladiwostok, Opladen 1997.
- Warner, Daniel (Ed.)*, Preventive Diplomacy: The United Nations and the OSCE, Geneva 1996.
- Wenig, Marcus*, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Streitbeilegung ethnischer Konflikte durch die OSZE, dargestellt am Konflikt im ehemaligen Jugoslawien, Berlin 1996.
- Wollefs, Elisabeth*, Sicherheit durch Minderheitenschutz. Der Beitrag der Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa (OSZE) zur Bearbeitung ethnopolitischer Konflikte, INEF-Report, Duisburg 1996.

#### Articles

- Afanasievskii, Nikolai*, The OSCE Summit in Lisbon, in: International Affairs (Moscow) 1/1997, pp. 33-36.
- Aragona, Giancarlo*, Lissabon und danach: Die OSZE in einer neuen europäischen Sicherheitsstruktur, in: NATO Brief 2/1997, pp. 7-10.
- Bloed, Arie*, Die OSZE und nationale Minderheiten. Eine neue Herangehensweise, in: *M. Mohr (Ed.)*, Friedenssichernde Aspekte des Minderheitenschutzes in der Ära des Völkerbundes und der Vereinten Nationen in Europa, Frankfurt/Oder 1996, pp. 153-165.
- Bloed, Arie*, Increasing OSCE involvement in the former Yugoslavia, in: Helsinki Monitor 2/1996, pp. 65-72.
- Bloed, Arie*, OSCE and conflict in Chechnya, in: Helsinki Monitor 3/1996, pp. 82-87.
- Bloed, Arie*, OSCE approves the outcome of the Bosnian elections, in: Helsinki Monitor 4/1996, pp. 86-90.
- Bloed, Arie*, Lisbon Summit mandates the revision of the CFE Treaty, in: Helsinki Monitor 1/1997, pp. 75-82.
- Bloed, Arie*, The OSCE response to conflicts in the region, in: Helsinki Monitor 2/1997, pp. 49-55.
- Borawski, John/Bruce George*, The OSCE in transition: A preliminary agenda for Lisbon and beyond, in: Helsinki Monitor 3/1996, pp. 11-19.
- Borawski, John*, The OSCE: In Search of Cooperative Security, in: Security Dialogue 4/1996, pp. 401-408.
- Bollow, Undine*, OSCE Mission - mis see on? Eindrücke aus der Arbeit in der OSZE-Mission in Estland, in: Berliner Osteuropa Info 7/1996, pp. 15-19.
- Brett, Rachel*, Human Rights and the OSCE, in: Human Rights Quarterly

- 3/1996, pp. 668-693.
- Brown, Sam W.*, A New Organization Faces New Threats to Security, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 66-69.
- Chigas, Diana/Elisabeth McClintock/Christopher Kamp*, Preventive Diplomacy and the OSCE: Creating Incentives for Dialogue and Cooperation, in: *Abram Chayes/Antonia Handler (Eds.)*, Preventing Conflict in the Post-Communist World. Mobilizing International and Regional Organizations, Washington D.C. 1996, pp. 25-95.
- Constantinides, A.*, The Involvement of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in Issues of Minority Protection, in: *Leiden Journal of International Law* 2/1996, pp. 373-395.
- Cotti, Flavio*, Die zunehmenden Aufgaben der OSZE auf dem Gebiet der europäischen Sicherheit, in: *NATO Brief* 6/1996, pp. 7-12.
- Cotti, Flavio*, The Role of the OSCE and the Plans of the Chairmanship in 1996, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 12-17.
- Czempiel, Ernst-Otto*, Die Neuordnung Europas. Was leisten NATO und OSZE für die Kooperation mit Osteuropa und Rußland?, in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 1-2/1997, pp. 34-45.
- Czempiel, Ernst-Otto*, Europas Machtfigur. Das föderal-demokratische Herrschaftssystem enthält die beste Friedensgarantie, die es geben kann, in: *FAZ* vom 15. März 1997, p. 11.
- Daeniker, Gustav*, On the OSCE's Strategic Role and Public Profile, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 94-100.
- Denbar, Rachel*, The legacy of abuse in Chechnya and OSCE intervention, in: *Helsinki Monitor* 1/1997, pp. 59-74.
- Dunay, Pál*, The Chairman-in-Office and the Secretary General, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 102-107.
- Eiff, Hansjörg*, The OSCE in the Development of a New Security Architecture, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 70-73.
- Estebanéz, Maria A. M.*, The OSCE Implementation Meeting on Human Dimension Issues, in: *Helsinki Monitor* 1/1996, pp. 5-26.
- Gasteyger, Curt*, Chancen und Grenzen gesamteuropäischer Sicherheit, in: *Europäische Rundschau* 1/1997, pp. 39-46.
- Gasteyger, Curt*, The OSCE: Overrated or Underestimated?, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 88-93.
- George, Bruce*, An OSCE Academy?, in: *Helsinki Monitor* 2/1997, pp. 23-30.
- George, Bruce*, Forging the NATO-OSCE Partnership, in: *OSCE Bulletin* 3/1996, pp. 45-47.
- Ghebali, Victor-Yves*, La contribution de l'OSCE à la gestion du conflit yougoslave (1991-1995), in: *Revue militaire suisse* 2/1996, pp. 11-17.
- Gow, James*, Stratified Stability: Interpreting International Order, in:

- Brassey's Defence Yearbook 1997, London 1997, pp. 349-365.
- Greene, Bonnie*, Giving Real Life to the Vienna Agreement on Religious Freedom, in: OSCE Bulletin 2/1997, pp. 11-14.
- Groll, Götz von*, Von der Familienzusammenführung zum Minderheitenschutz - neue Aufgaben für die "menschliche Dimension" der KSZE, in: Berliner Europa Forum 12/1994, pp. 11-16.
- Guerra, Stefano*, The Multi-Faceted Role of the ODIHR, in: OSCE Bulletin 2/1996, pp. 10-20.
- Gyarmati, István*, Security and Stability in Europe: Dangers and Means to Face Them, in: Europai Szemle (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 43-60.
- Ham, Peter van*, Europe's security garden?, in: Helsinki Monitor 2/1997, pp. 47-48.
- Hazdra, Peter*, Die OSZE-Mission in Bosnien-Herzegowina, in: Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift 6/1996, pp. 695-699.
- Höynck, Wilhelm*, The OSCE and its Contribution to New Stability, in: Europai Szemle (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 18-28.
- Hübschen, Jürgen*, Für die OSZE in Lettland, in: Europäische Sicherheit 7/1997, pp. 35-36.
- Joetze, Günter*, Conflict Prevention and Crisis Resolution in Europe, in: Reinhard Rummel (Ed.), Crises Policies in Eastern Europe, Baden-Baden 1996, pp. 195-204.
- Kazimirov, Vladimir*, The OSCE and Nagorno-Karabakh, in: Europai Szemle (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 81-87.
- Kemp, Walter*, Hungary's Chairmanship: An Assessment, in: Europai Szemle (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 108-119.
- Kobieracki, Adam*, Military aspects of security: Expectations regarding the OSCE Lisbon Summit, in: Helsinki Monitor 3/1996, pp. 52-64.
- Kohlschütter, Andreas V.*, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Präventivdiplomatie. Das Beispiel der OSZE-Mission in der Ukraine, in: Österreichisches Studienzentrums für Frieden und Konfliktlösung (Ed.), Theorie und Praxis ziviler Konfliktbearbeitung. Friedensbericht 1996, Zurich 1996, pp. 125-148.
- Kovács, László*, The Hungarian Chairmanship, in: Europai Szemle (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 87-90.
- Kovács, László*, Opening Statement at the OSCE Ministerial Council Meeting, Budapest, 7 December 1995, in: OSCE Bulletin 2/1996, pp. 1-5.
- Kümmel, Gerhard*, From Yesterday to Tomorrow - CSCE/OSCE at Twenty: Achievements of the Past and Challenges of the Future, in: OSCE Bulletin 1/1995-1996, pp. 8-16.
- Kwaastaniet, Marjanne de*, The Security Model discussion and its importance for the evolution of the European security architecture, in: Helsinki Monitor 3/1996, pp. 30-40.
- Leben, Charles*, La mise en place de la Cour de conciliation et d'arbitrage au

- sein de l'OSCE, in: *Revue générale de droit international public* 1/1996, pp. 135-148.
- Lord, Karen S.*, What Does Religious Liberty in the OSCE Mean in Practice?, in: *OSCE Bulletin* 2/1997, pp. 9-10.
- MacFarlane, S. Neil*, On the Front Lines in the Near Abroad: the CIS and OSCE in Georgia's Civil Wars, in: *Third World Quarterly* 3/1997, pp. 509-526.
- Matejka, Zdenek*, OSCE and its impact on state policies, in: *Perspectives* 6-7/1996, pp. 101-110.
- Mazilu, Dumitru*, OSCE and its Role in the Future European Security Structure, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 78-80.
- Merk, Peter-Josef*, Gipfelgespräche. OSZE und NATO, in: *Europäische Sicherheit* 5/1997, pp. 43-45.
- Meyer, Berthold*, Zur Konfliktlösungskapazität der Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa (OSZE), in: *Österreichisches Studienzentrum für Frieden und Konfliktlösung* (Ed.), *Interventionen? Politik der Einmischung in einer turbulenten Welt*, Münster 1996, pp. 94-109.
- Meyer, Berthold/Peter Schlotter*, Die Mühen der Gewaltprävention: Die OSZE vor einer Renaissance?, in: *Friedhelm Solms/Bruno Schoch/Reinhard Mutz* (Eds.), *Friedensgutachten 1997*, Münster 1997, pp. 143-155.
- Mietzsch, Oliver*, Die KSZE/OSZE und die gewaltfreie Lösung von Konflikten. Lehren der Vergangenheit und Perspektiven für die Zukunft, in: *Antimilitarismus Information* 12/1995, pp. 44-49.
- Mihalka, Michael*, A marriage of convenience: The OSCE and Russia in Nagorno-Karabakh and Chechnya, in: *Helsinki Monitor* 2/1996, pp. 13-28.
- Mihalka, Michael*, Building consensus: The Security Model in light of previous security arrangements in Europe, in: *Helsinki Monitor* 3/1996, pp. 20-29.
- Milinkovic, Branislav*, The OSCE and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: Changes and challenges, in: *Helsinki Monitor* 2/1997, pp. 5-13.
- Moltke, Gebhart von*, NATO and the OSCE: an Evolving Partnership for a New Europe, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 61-65.
- Moreno, Pedro C.*, The Status of Religious Freedom in OSCE Countries, in: *OSCE Bulletin* 2/1997, pp. 7-8.
- Morrill, Keith M.*, Implementation of OSCE Commitments in the Human Dimension, Report of Working Group One, in: *OSCE Bulletin* 1/1996-1997, pp. 9-13.
- Mutz, Reinhard*, UNO und OSZE zunehmend entmachtet, in: *Das Parlament* vom 16. Mai 1997, p. 5.
- Nagy, Zoltan*, From Helsinki to Budapest, in: *Europai Szemle* (Budapest), Vol. VII, 1996, Special Issue, pp. 29-42.

- Niemtzow, Elisa*, The OSCE's Security Model: Conceptual confusion and competing visions, in: Helsinki Monitor 3/1996, pp. 41-51.
- Nispen, Pieter van*, A Wider Concept of Security, in: Brassey's Defence Yearbook 1997, London 1997, pp. 366-375.
- Oliver, R. Spencer*, The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly: A Unique OSCE Institution, in: OSCE Bulletin 1/1995-1996, pp. 26-31.
- Packer, J.*, The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, in: Human Rights Tribune 4/1996, p. 37.
- Paul, Diane*, Human rights and the elections in Bosnia, in: Helsinki Monitor 4/1996, pp. 5-18.
- Pentikäinen, Merja*, The Human Dimension of the OSCE in the 1996 Vienna Review Meeting, in: Helsinki Monitor 1/1997, pp. 5-18.
- Peters, Ingo*, From the CSCE to the OSCE - Institutional Quality and Political Meaning, in: *Ingo Peters (Ed.)*, New Security Challenges: The Adaptation of International Institutions, Münster 1996, pp. 85-122.
- Peters, Ingo*, The Organization for Security and Co-operation, in: *Axel Krohn (Ed.)*, The Baltic Sea Region, Baden-Baden 1996, pp. 224-248.
- Plate, Bernard von*, Die OSZE - ein Lieblingskind der russischen Regierung?, in: *Winrich Kühne (Ed.)*, Die Außenpolitik der Russischen Föderation: Großmachtsanspruch - ungelöste Transformationsaufgaben - innere Schwäche, Ebenhausen 1996, pp. 87-97.
- Plate, Bernard von*, Kaum Fortschritte. Die OSZE nach dem Gipfel von Lissabon, in: Information für die Truppe 3/1997, pp. 35-41.
- Prins, Daniel/Hanno Würzner*, Transition or tradition? The United Nations, the OSCE and electoral assistance, in: Helsinki Monitor 4/1996, pp. 19-31.
- Rönquist, A.*, The Functions of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities with Special Regard to Conflict Prevention, in: *Eckhart Klein (Ed.)*, The Institution of a Commissioner for Human Rights and Minorities and the Prevention of Human Rights Violations, Berlin 1995, pp. 43-52.
- Rodley, Nigel S.*, The OSCE and the Problem of Torture, in: OSCE Bulletin 3/1996, pp. 54-56.
- Roloff, Ralf*, Prinzipien der OSZE für Fragen der Konfliktlösung und des Zusammenlebens mit Minderheiten, in: *T. Bremer (Ed.)*, Religion und Nation im Krieg auf dem Balkan, Bonn 1996, pp. 173-186.
- Rotfeld, Adam Daniel*, The OSCE in 1995: Activities and Assessments, in: *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (Ed.)*, SIPRI Yearbook 1996, Oxford 1996, pp. 296-306.
- Rotfeld, Adam Daniel*, Europe: In Search of Cooperative Security, in: *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (Ed.)*, SIPRI Yearbook 1997, Oxford 1997, pp. 127-149.
- Ruperez, Javier*, The 1996 Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, in: Helsinki Monitor 4/1996, pp. 72-74.

- Sandrock, Nancy Lee*, An OSCE Field Office Experience, in: OSCE Bulletin 4/1996, pp. 25-28.
- Sapiro, M.*, Changing the CSCE into the OSCE: Legal Aspects of a Political Transformation, in: American Journal of International Law 3/1995, pp. 631-637.
- Schelter, Kurt*, Bekämpfung der Organisierten Kriminalität als Herausforderung für Europa - auch für die OSZE?, in: Integration 2/1996, pp. 102-109.
- Schlager, Erika B.*, From Budapest to Lisbon, in: Helsinki Monitor 3/1996, pp. 7-10.
- Schlager, Erika B.*, The right to have rights: Citizenship in newly independent OSCE countries, in: Helsinki Monitor 1/1997, pp. 19-37.
- Schlotter, Peter*, Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa, in: *Beate Kohler-Koch/Wichard Woyke (Eds.)*, Lexikon der Politik, Bd. 5: Europäische Gemeinschaft, Munich 1996, pp. 203-208.
- Schmidt, Christian*, Frieden für Europa im 21. Jahrhundert. Strukturelemente einer europäischen Friedensordnung, in: *Wolfgang Schäuble/Rudolf Seiters (Eds.)*, Außenpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert. Die Thesen der Jungen Außenpolitiker, Bonn 1996, pp. 87-88.
- Schneider, Heinrich*, OSZE und gesamteuropäische Kooperation, in: *Werner Weidenfeld/Wolfgang Wessels (Eds.)*, Jahrbuch der Europäischen Integration 1995/96, pp. 383-392.
- Schütze, Walter*, Das Zusammenwirken der KSZE mit anderen Institutionen auf dem Gebiet der Frühwarnung, des Krisenmanagements und des Aufbaus neuer Sicherheitsstrukturen in Europa, in: Berliner Europa Forum 2/1995, pp. 20-26.
- Sica, Mario*, The role of the OSCE in the former Yugoslavia after the Dayton Peace Agreement, in: Helsinki Monitor 2/1996, pp. 5-12.
- SIPRI*, Final report of the Independent Working Group on "a future security agenda for Europe", in: Helsinki Monitor 4/1996, pp. 75-85, and in the present volume, pp. 497-512.
- Sneek, Tim*, Complementarity and cooperation: The OSCE as part of a European Security Model for the 21st Century, in: Helsinki Monitor 4/1996, pp. 51-71.
- Stoel, Max van der*, Demokratie und Menschenrechte, in: Rissener Rundbrief 4-5/1997, pp. 63-72.
- Stoel, Max van der*, The Role of the OSCE in Conflict Prevention, in: Studia Diplomatica 6/1996, pp. 33-39.
- Stoel, Max van der*, Perspectives of the OSCE in tomorrow's Europe, in: From 1975 to 1995 and Beyond: The Achievements of the CSCE - The Perspectives of the OSCE, Statements of the panellists at the Geneva Seminar on the Occasion of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, Geneva, Oktober 1995, pp. 53-54.
- Tesar, Karel*, Can the OSCE Provide for Collective Security in Europe?, in:

- Perspectives, Summer 1997, pp. 79-94.
- Terpstra, Rienk W.*, The Mediterranean basin as a new playing field for European security organisations, in: Helsinki Monitor 1/1997, pp. 48-58.
- Troebst, Stefan*, Kein spektakulärer Erfolg - aber Spannungen reduziert. Die OSZE in der Republik Moldova, in: Wissenschaft und Frieden 1/1997, pp. 23-27.
- Troebst, Stefan*, "Dicke Bretter, schwache Bohrer". Die Langzeitmissionen der OSZE, in: *Dieter Senghaas (Ed.)*, Frieden machen, Frankfurt/ Main 1997, pp. 147-165.
- Troebst, Stefan*, Frühwarnung, präventive Diplomatie und Krisenmanagement der KSZE/OSZE in Osteuropa, in: Politische Studien 3/1995, pp. 132-148.
- Tscharner, Benedikt von*, Der OSZE-Vorsitz als Teil der schweizerischen Aussenpolitik, in: ASMZ 10/1996, pp. 7-9.
- Tudyka, Kurt P.*, Perspektiven der OSZE, in: Vorgänge 135, September 1996, pp. 33-40.
- Tudyka, Kurt P.*, Auf der Suche nach Sicherheit für Europa - Die OSZE, in: Osnabrücker Jahrbuch Frieden und Wissenschaft, Osnabrück 1996, pp. 118-127.
- Voß, Hans*, Über der NATO-Erweiterung die OSZE nicht vergessen, in: FAZ vom 24. Juli 1997, p. 9.
- Wenger, Andreas/Christoph Breitenmoser*, OSZE-Vorsitz der Schweiz. Umfassende Herausforderung - beschränkte Handlungsmöglichkeiten, in: Strategie 1/1996, pp. 14-20.
- Wenger, Andreas/Christoph Breitenmoser/Heiko Borchert*, Das schweizerische OSZE-Präsidialjahr 1996, in: Bulletin zur schweizerischen Sicherheitspolitik 1996/97, Zürich 1997, pp. 4-46.
- Wright, Jane*, The OSCE and the Protection of Minority Rights, in: Human Rights Quarterly 1/1996, pp. 190-205.
- Zaagman, Rob*, Some reflections on OSCE conflict prevention and the Code of Conduct, in: Helsinki Monitor 2/1996, pp. 29-39.
- Zaagman, Rob*, OSCE peacekeeping: A useful "harder" option, in: Helsinki Monitor 3/1996, pp. 65-71.





## Acronyms

APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CBSS	Council of the Baltic Sea States
CEFTA	Central European Free Trade Agreement
CEI	Central European Initiative
CFE I	Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CFE I A	Concluding Act of the Negotiations on Personnel Strength of Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy (of the EU)
CiO	Chairman-in-Office
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CPC	Conflict Prevention Centre
CSBMs	Confidence- and Security-Building Measures
CSCE	Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (since 1 January 1995 OSCE)
CSO	Committee of Senior Officials (since 1 January 1995 Senior Council)
DAP	Democratic Assistance Programme (of the PA)
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe (of the UNO)
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECMM	European Community Monitor Mission
ECT	Treaty establishing the European Community
ECU	European Currency Unit
EPC	European Political Cooperation (of the EC)
EU	European Union
ETUC	European Trade Union Confederation
FRY	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
FSC	Forum for Security Co-operation
FTAA	The Free Trade Area of the Americas
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
G-7/G-8	Group of Seven (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, USA)/ G-8: G-7 and Russia
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
HCA	Helsinki Citizens' Assembly
HCNM	High Commissioner on National Minorities
HDZ	Croat Democratic Union
ICFTU	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
ICJ	International Court of Justice

ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IFC	Informal Financial Committee
IFOR	Implementation Force
IHF	International Helsinki Federation
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPTF	International Police Task Force
IST	International Trade Secretariats
MPC	Mediterranean Partners (of the OSCE) for Co-operation
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHR	Office of the High Representative
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PA	Parliamentary Assembly (of the OSCE)
PC	Permanent Council (of the OSCE)
PfP	Partnership for Peace
PHARE	Poland and Hungary Assistance for the Reconstruction of the Economy
PIC	Peace Implementation Conference
POE	Points of Entry/Exit
SAMs	Sanctions Assistance Missions
SAMCOMM	Sanctions Assistance Missions Communication Centre
SC	Senior Council (of the OSCE)
SDA	Party of Democratic Action (Bosnian)
SDS	Serb Democratic Party
SECI	Southeast European Cooperative Initiative
SFOR	Stabilization Force
TACIS	Technical Assistance for the CIS
TLE	Treaty Limited Equipment (CFE I Treaty)
UN/UNO	United Nations/United Nations Organization
UNCHR	United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
UNTAES	United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia
UNTS	United Nations Treaty Series

VD 90, 92, 94	Vienna Document on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (1990, 1992, 1994)
WCL	World Confederation of Labour
WEU	Western European Union
WTO	Warsaw Treaty Organization



## Contributors

*Prof. Dr Alice Ackermann*, Assistant Professor at the Graduate School of International Studies, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida

*Giancarlo Aragona*, Secretary General of the OSCE, Vienna

*Çigdem Akkaya*, Bachelor of Economics, Head of the Turkish Department and Deputy Director of the Centre for Turkish Studies, University Essen

*Hayrettin Aydin*, Research Fellow at the Centre for Turkish Studies, University Essen

*Prof. Dr Lucius Caflisch*, Legal Adviser of the Swiss Department of Foreign Affairs, Professor at the Institut universitaire de hautes études internationales, Geneva

*Dr Marie-Janine Calic*, Senior Research Fellow at the Research Institute of the Foundation Science and Politics (SWP), Ebenhausen

*Laurence Cuny*, Assistant at the Institut universitaire de hautes études internationales, Geneva

*Prof. Dr Jonathan Dean*, Ambassador ret., Union of Concerned Scientists, Washington D.C.

*Prof. Dr Pál Dunay*, Deputy Director, Hungarian Institute of International Affairs, Budapest

*Freimut Duve*, Member of Parliament (Bundestag), Chairman of the General Committee on Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Questions of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, Vienna

*Joachim Eicher*, M.A., Doctorand at the Albert-Ludwigs-University, Freiburg, Long-Term-Observers of the OSCE in Mostar and in the western Herzegovina (July - Sept. 1996), since February 1997 Mission Member of the OSCE Mission to Croatia

*Tom Etty*, Official in Charge of International Questions at the Federal Board of the Federation of Trade Unions of the Netherlands, Nijmegen

*Anda Filip*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania, Second Secretary, OSCE Desk Officer, Bucharest

*Prof. Dr Curt Gasteyger*, 1974 - 1994 Professor for International Relations at the Institut universitaire de hautes études internationales in Geneva, 1994 ret., since 1978 Director of the "Programme for Strategic and International Security Studies"

*Audrey F. Glover*, Ambassador, former Director of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the OSCE

*Prof. Dr Tim Guldemann*, Ambassador, Head of the OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya, January 1996 - April 1997

- Dr Rüdiger Hartmann*, Ambassador and Government Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control, Bonn
- Dr Hans-Joachim Heintze*, Research Fellow, Institute for International Law of Peace and Armed Conflict, Ruhr-University Bochum
- Dr Herbert Honsowitz*, Director of the OSCE Department, Foreign Office, Bonn
- Dr Kostas Ifantis*, University of Athens, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Programme of Postgraduate Studies in "European Organisation and Diplomacy", Athens
- Prof. Dr Dr h.c. mult. Knut Ipsen*, Director of the Institute for International Law of Peace and Armed Conflict, Ruhr-University Bochum, President of the German Red Cross
- Shannon Kile*, Secretary of the Independent Working Group, Research Assistant at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Stockholm
- Michael Klepsch*, Counsellor at the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE, Vienna
- Michael Klor-Berchtold*, Personal Assistant of the first and the second Secretary General of the OSCE 1993 to 1997, Vienna
- Falk Lange*, M.A., Deputy Head of the OSCE Mission to Latvia, Riga
- Dr Dr Dieter S. Lutz*, Director of the IFSH, Hamburg
- Norbert Mappes-Niediek*, Balkans Correspondent for several German newspapers, Lieboch near Graz
- Dr Emil Mintchev*, Envoy, Embassy of the Republic of Bulgaria, Bonn
- Prof. Dr Adam Daniel Rotfeld*, Co-chairman of the Independent Working Group, Director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Stockholm
- Ben Schennink*, Research Fellow, Studiecentrum voor Vredesvraagstukken, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Adviser of Pax Christi and the Interkerkelijk Vredesberaad (IKV)
- Dr Walter Jürgen Schmid*, Director, Foreign Office, Bonn
- Prof. Dr Heinrich Schneider*, Deputy Head of the Delegation of the Holy See to the OSCE, Kaltenleutgeben, Austria
- Prof. Dr Faruk Sen*, Director of the Centre for Turkish Studies, University Essen
- Prof. Dr Predrag Simic*, Director of the Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade
- Marin Stanescu*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania, Deputy Director, Directorate for OSCE, Council of Europe and Subregional Co-operation, Bucharest
- Dr Max van der Stoep*, OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, The Hague
- Prof. Dr Rita Süßmuth*, President of the German Bundestag since 25 November 1988, Head of the German Delegation to the Parliamentary As-

sembly of the OSCE

*Ed van Thijn*, Former Netherlands' Minister of the Interior and Mayor of Amsterdam, OSCE Co-ordinator for International Monitoring (CIM) of the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina 1996

*Prof. Dr Kurt P. Tudyka*, Prof. ret., Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Editor-in-Chief of the OSCE-Yearbook

*Prof. Dr Takako Ueta*, International Christian University, Tokyo

*Rolf Welberts*, 1993 Mission Member of the OSCE Mission to Moldova, 1994-95 Mission Member of the OSCE Mission to Georgia, since the end of 1995 Legal Adviser of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations, New York

*Dr Marcus Wenig*, Assessor jur., from November 1996 to April 1997 Member of the Conflict Prevention Centre and of the OSCE Secretariat (Vienna) and in the OSCE Department of the GD I.A of the EU Commission, Brussels

*Prof. Dr Andrei Zagorski*, Deputy Director of the Moscow State Institute for International Relations, Moscow

*Dr Wolfgang Zellner*, Research Fellow at the IFSH, Hamburg