



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

FSC.AIAM/49/98

11 March 1998

ENGLISH only

---

**Department for Conference Services**

Please find attached the Chairman's Report and Summaries of the Working Group  
Co-ordinators of the 1998 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting.



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

FSC.AIAM/49/98

11 March 1998

ENGLISH only

---

**Department for Conference Services**

1998 ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION  
ASSESSMENT MEETING

Vienna, 2-4 March 1998

SUMMARY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chairman's Report .....	1
 <u>Summaries of the Working Group Co-ordinators:</u>	
Working Group I: Agenda item 2(a) .....	6
Working Group II: Agenda item 2(b).....	8
Working Group III: Agenda items 2(c) .....	9
Working Group III: Agenda items 2(d) .....	12
Working Group IV: Agenda items 2(e) .....	15
Working Group IV: Agenda items 2(f).....	16
Working Group V: Agenda item 2(g).....	17
Working Group VI: Agenda item 3 .....	18
 Annex: Agenda, timetable and other organizational modalities (FSC.DEC/2/98).....	 22

# CHAIRMAN'S REPORT TO THE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION ON THE ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING

Vienna, 2-4 March 1998

Mr. Chairman,

It is an honour to me, in my capacity as Chairman of the closing plenary meeting of the 8th Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting, to report to the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) on the discussions and results of this meeting.

In accordance with the relevant decision of the FSC, the AIAM 1998 took place from 2 to 4 March this year.

The aim of this meeting was, in accordance with and on the basis of Chapter 10 of the Vienna Document 1994, to assess the current status of implementation of all provisions of the Vienna Document and to discuss ways of improving the implementation record where that seems necessary. Apart from the discussions on the Vienna Document, and again in fulfilment of the relevant decision of the FSC, several other documents agreed by the Forum were subjected to evaluation. These included the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security, the Global Exchange of Military Information, Principles Governing Non-proliferation, Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers, and Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations.

The Mediterranean partners for co-operation as well as Japan and the Republic of Korea were present at the opening and closing plenary meetings.

As at previous AIAMs, the broad participation of experts from capitals helped significantly to hold a lively and thought-provoking exchange of views.

The Chairman of the Forum for Security Co-operation presented to the AIAM his report on the current work of the Forum, a report dedicated largely to implementation issues. A brief presentation concerning the implementation of agreed measures was given by the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), which also presented some concluding remarks at the closing plenary meeting.

The Delegation of Sweden unilaterally organized two workshops at the margins of the AIAM, one on the Global Exchange of Military Information and the other on Defence Planning.

The co-ordinator of the ad hoc working group on modernization of the Vienna Document, recently established in the FSC, presented his report on the work of this group, together with some personal views on the discussions held during the AIAM from the perspective of their possible implications for ongoing debate in the FSC.

Because the FSC had already initiated the negotiation on the Vienna Document modernization within the working group, the discussion at the AIAM gained a specific dimension and "flavour"; some of the ideas presented at the meeting may be further considered and explained in greater detail in the framework of the Vienna Document

negotiation. Suggestions and proposals related to measures other than the Vienna Document should be subject to consideration within the respective FSC bodies.

The main business of the present AIAM meeting remained the assessment of implementation and verification of agreed measures to date. Some delegations, however, when presenting their views on implementation issues, referred to the ideas and concepts currently being discussed in the Vienna Document modernization talks. This was, in the view of the Chair, a distinctive element of the 1998 AIAM.

Mr. Chairman,

The proceedings of this year's AIAM involved discussions in the two plenary meetings and in six working groups, chaired by co-ordinators. Several delegations presented written statements during the plenary meetings. The co-ordinators submitted to the AIAM reports on the results of the discussions held in their working groups and these documents have already been distributed. Let me, in speaking about the conclusions that emerged from the discussions held at the meeting, base my remarks on these excellent reports, which will be formally transmitted to the FSC together with my present report.

#### Working Group I: annual exchange of military information

There was general agreement that these provisions constitute a basis for the implementation of all other provisions of the Vienna Document. Delegations also agreed that the overall trend regarding compliance with the exchange of information is positive and that there has been a real improvement in comparison to the past. At the same time, however, certain shortcomings were noticed, particularly in relation to the timeliness of the exchange of information and small discrepancies in the data exchanged.

There were some proposals for the establishment of a clear mechanism to remind participating States of their commitments. The possibility of giving technical assistance to the States that have problems with implementation was mentioned, including some involvement of the CPC.

There was a discussion on measures to increase the transparency and relevance of the annual exchange of information. It was noted that some proposals were already being discussed in the context of the modernization of the Vienna Document. In addition, several suggestions from previous meetings were recalled.

#### Working Group II: defence planning

The growing role of this instrument was underlined by several speakers as favouring enhanced transparency and predictability in the military activities of participating States. Some problems were raised in connection with the punctual presentation of the document, its readability and the standard of the data contained in it. A number of ideas were put forward as to how the quality and clarity of the information submitted might be improved. There were some ideas on enhancing the scope of the information submitted on defence planning.

#### Working Group III: military activities

Discussion took place on the existing provisions, including thresholds for notification and observation. There was a general understanding that these questions should be considered further in the ad hoc working group on modernization of the Vienna Document.

Delegations exchanged views and put forward suggestions on a wide range of issues, which may be grouped as follows: practical matters regarding observations, the importance of annual calendars and information concerning constraining provisions, definitions, thresholds for notification, thresholds for observation, and multilateral activities.

In general it was felt that the discussions had created valuable “food for thought” for the working group on modernization of the Vienna Document.

#### Working Group III: compliance and verification

A general improvement of implementation was noted. Some speakers stressed the intensification of activities between neighbouring States. As in previous years, the issue of rapid exhaustion of evaluation quotas at the beginning of the year was discussed. Several proposals were made in this regard. There was a discussion on the issue of multinational evaluation visits and inspections marked by a general understanding that such endeavours had growing potential. The problem of increasing the number of quotas was deliberated, as was the possibility of spreading quotas over the calendar year. Some speakers raised the problem of costs, which might affect the implementation of some of the proposals submitted. A number of suggestions were made concerning practical arrangements for visits and inspections and clarification or interpretation of some existing provisions.

Some delegations announced decisions to offer additional quotas.

#### Working Group IV: contacts

It was noted that, according to the various CPC surveys, the number of activities reported was somewhat limited - mainly visits to air bases, visits to military facilities and demonstrations of major new weapons systems. Delegations were encouraged to provide additional information on contacts not yet reported to the CPC.

Several delegations provided information on bilateral or sub-regional agreements and contacts. In addition, several invitations for planned events in the future were announced.

A few suggestions were made on ways of improving the exchange of information on contacts and practical arrangements for planned events.

#### Working Group IV: risk reduction

It was confirmed that the measure in its present form continues to be a useful tool. Some delegates noted, however, that there was room for improvement and that more concrete proposals had already been proposed, including further strengthening of the consultation mechanism. The OSCE-wide and regional dimension of this measure was also briefly discussed.

Discussion also touched upon measures relating to “unusual military activities” and “hazardous incidents”.

#### Working Group V: communications

The essential role of the OSCE network in implementing the provisions of the Vienna Document was emphasized. Some debate took place on the possibilities for involving communication experts in the process of modernizing the Vienna Document. The problem of granting a budget to the Communications Group was also touched upon. The exchange of views on both issues was inconclusive, however.

Delegations emphasized the importance of using the Standard Operating Procedures to improve the functioning of the network.

There were some practical suggestions concerning the reporting by the Communication Group to the AIAM.

#### Working Group VI: operation and implementation of other agreed measures/documents - assessment, clarification and conclusions

There was a lively exchange of views on several documents: the Global Exchange of Military Information, Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers, Principles Governing Non-Proliferation, Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations and the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security.

A number of concrete proposals and recommendations were made on ways of improving implementation and on the possible development of the measures themselves. Some of the measures were referred to in the context of the modernization of the Vienna Document. Many delegations provided information about steps being taken by their countries to implement these measures. Several delegations announced forthcoming proposals in the FSC.

In general, the debate confirmed that all documents discussed under this agenda item remain vital components of the framework of agreements adopted by the FSC, and complement the CSBMs in the Vienna Document 1994.

Mention should be made of the discussion on CSBMs in connection with regional and subregional arrangements: in this regard some delegations, mainly from the Baltic and Black Sea regions, presented initiatives and plans for regional and subregional co-operation. Attention was also drawn to the existing proposal for a menu of regional measures. There was a suggestion that the FSC, when considering regional issues, should take into account the co-operation that has already taken place and also that any kind of regional undertakings should avoid fragmentation of security and should be based on clearly defined needs and interests. Some discussion took place on the existing forms of regional security and on the possibilities for including regional measures in the modernized Vienna Document. Several delegations argued that regional measures, if included in the Vienna Document, would not be in competition with but would be complementary to pan-European measures.

More detailed information on the discussion and proposals in the working groups can be found in the reports of co-ordinators. It is the conviction of the Chair that this entire inventory deserves further consideration by the various FSC bodies.

In addition, it is worth mentioning here that several documents drafted by the CPC on implementation of the Vienna Document and other agreed measures were distributed before the AIAM. These surveys were extremely useful in preparation for and discussion at the meeting. In accordance with the relevant decisions of the FSC and on the basis of well-established practice, the CPC was also entrusted with the task of preparing a summary of the suggestions made at the AIAM.

All in all, the discussions during the AIAM produced some interesting results in the form of concepts or more detailed proposals. It will be the responsibility of the FSC to deal with this material as appropriate. Suitable follow-up in the FSC will ensure that due attention is paid to implementation issues. Some of the ideas discussed at this Meeting might also be useful in the ongoing debate on modernization of the Vienna Document.

Before concluding, I would like to inform the FSC that the AIAM has agreed that the next meeting should take place in early March 1999. The precise dates and modalities will be finalized within the Forum for Security Co-operation.

Let me take this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation to all participants in the AIAM, and particularly to the co-ordinators and the CPC.

Thank you for your attention.



## WORKING GROUP I

Monday, 2 March 1998

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2:       Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the  
Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (a):               annual exchange of military information
- 

Working Group I had a full and lively discussion on implementation of the provisions relating to the Annual Exchange of Military Information under the Vienna Document 1994. Delegations were in agreement about the crucial nature of the information exchange as the basis for all Vienna Document related CSBMs. There was also agreement that the overall trend in relation to the provision of the information was a positive one, with a great majority of participating States making their returns in full and on time. It was regretted, however, that a small number of participating States had still not sent their information. These States were encouraged by various delegations to make use of the provision in Paragraph 147.3 of the Vienna Document and explain the reasons for the delay. With regard to a specific case, one delegation regretted that this opportunity had not been used, not least because the information would in any event have been compiled under the provisions of Annex 1b of the GFAP.

There was wide agreement among delegations that there was a need for the institution of a follow-up mechanism which could remind participating States of their obligations in respect of the provision of information under the Vienna Document. It was suggested that a reminder letter could be issued by the CPC before the date of exchange each year. In the event of non-submission of the information, subsequent letters could then be sent immediately following the date of exchange and just prior to the AIAM. It was recognized that there could be technical difficulties for some participating States in supplying the information and various participating States offered to provide assistance, with the help of the CPC, in this respect.

Various measures were discussed with the aim of increasing the transparency and relevance of the Annual Exchange of Information. It was noted that many of these proposals were already being discussed in the context of the Vienna Document Review but that all had relevance for the implementation of the Vienna Document. A proposal was made in relation to paragraph 10.3.1 in relation to the lowering of thresholds for notification and shortening the time period for notifications of planned increases in personnel strength. There was also discussion as to the possibility of the inclusion in the information exchange of information relating to paramilitary forces, in particular in relation to those paramilitary forces which were in possession of weapons and equipment within the meaning of the Vienna Document 1994. Extension of the units to cover non-combat units was also mentioned. In this respect attention was drawn to the need to ensure that information required should be verifiable. With regard to the quality of information provided, some delegations made proposals which would allow for the central changes that take place in the course of the year to be reflected in the information provided.

With a view to simplifying demands on participating States, delegations recalled previous suggestions in relation to the possibility of combining the Annual Exchange of Information and the GEMI. One delegation recalled its proposal that matters would be simplified for participating States if at least the date of these two exchanges of information could be synchronized.

In summary, the Working Group had a thorough review of ongoing implementation issues. The overall feeling of the group was of a definite improvement in relation to the information supplied in the previous year. A good deal of consideration was given to how implementation of existing commitments could be ameliorated while many ideas were put forward on how commitments could be widened and developed in order further to contribute to transparency and confidence building in the OSCE area.

WORKING GROUP II

Monday, 2 March 1998

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2:      Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the  
                                 Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (b):      defence planning
- 

Many delegations stressed the distinctive character of the Defence Planning section of the Vienna Document 1994, as a mean of enhanced transparency and predictability among OSCE participating States.

It was pointed out that a considerable number of States had not provided information on Defence Planning, and the quality of the information already submitted was not of a satisfactory standard.

A number of ideas have been put forward on ways of improving the quality and clarity of the information submitted and thereby enhancing its value. Broad reference was made to the possibility of using certain qualitative criteria for analysing submitted information on Defence Planning and of creating appropriate forms that might facilitate adequate replies by participating States. One delegation suggested the inclusion of paramilitary forces in the Defence Planning section.

## WORKING GROUP III

Tuesday, 3 March 1998

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2:      Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the  
Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (c):                military activities
- 

The group had a rather lively exchange of views. For the sake of clarity, I will divide my report on the discussion into six categories:

- practical matters regarding observations
- the importance of annual calendars and information concerning constraining provisions
- definitions
- thresholds for notification
- thresholds for observation
- multilateral activities

#### Practical matters regarding observations

One delegation explained the difficulties of hosting an observation in rough weather and terrain. It was pointed out that such conditions could make it physically difficult to show as much as intended.

Another delegation suggested that the total number of participants could be limited to, say, 50. The CPC would then be responsible for the implementation of this limitation. This suggestion was contested by other delegations. One of them pointed out that the normal number of observers was not more than about 30 to 40. Moreover, observations could be arranged so that they did not become too expensive.

It was also suggested that the costs for the hosting of an observation could be distributed among the States taking part in the activity.

#### The importance of annual calendars and information regarding constraining provisions

The co-ordinator had asked whether the fact that only about 50 per cent of participating States submit annual calendars and information regarding constraining provisions should be of considered a matter for concern.

One delegation held the view that the problem lay not so much in a lack of information as in the risk of erosion of general implementation. The notification was merely a “mechanical” problem. This view was strongly opposed by another delegation, which argued that annual calendars contained very important information.

Another delegation suggested that § 67 of the VD 94 should be changed or abolished, as it was evident that a State not planning a notifiable activity would not carry out an activity covered by the constraining provisions.

### Definitions

Several delegations held the view that the scope of notification, and hence of observation, should be enlarged to cover “military activities” instead of “exercises”. At least one delegation saw the need to define “activity” and also to define thresholds appropriate to activities that were not exercises. The question of paramilitary forces was seen as particularly important in this regard.

One delegation stressed that a State must have the right to take appropriate actions in time of crisis without having to notify these or invite observers. The notion of “specific characteristics”, as agreed upon in Lisbon, should also be taken into account in this regard.

In this context, there was a discussion of the meaning of “military significance”, which is one of the criteria of the Madrid mandate. It was suggested that, as a consequence of the end of the cold war, this notion should now imply the risk of regional destabilization instead of pan-European destabilization.

### Thresholds for notification

One delegation reminded the group of its proposal that each State should notify its largest exercise, whether this was above the agreed threshold or not. Several delegations supported this idea, others contested it.

One delegation pointed out the link between notifications of exercises and inspections. A lower threshold would lead to enhanced possibilities for carrying out inspections.

Some delegations held the view that the issue of lower thresholds should be addressed mainly in a regional context. In this context, one delegation recapitulated its proposal regarding the notification of non-routine exercises.

### Thresholds for observation

This year, no delegation proposed that the agreed thresholds for observation should be lowered. However, one delegation suggested a redefinition. There were, according to this delegation, observable exercises that should not be observed. On the other hand there were activities that were observable but which were not covered by today’s thresholds. In particular, there should be a provision for observation of independent air activities. This suggestion was contested, however, on the grounds that such a provision would be impossible from a practical point of view as well as contrary to the Madrid mandate.

### Multinational activities

Several delegations informed the group about their notifications regarding participation in SFOR. This sparked an intense debate about multinational activities. Several delegations felt that such activities should be covered by the VD. Some delegations, however, questioned the practicality of observation. On the other hand, one delegation pointed out that this had been possible in connection with IFOR.

An interesting discussion concerned the interpretation of § 37 and 38.1. One delegation held the view that “single operational command” should be understood as also covering multinational commands. Another delegation contested this. The discussion was inconclusive, but there seemed to be a feeling that this question would have to be resolved during the revision of the VD.

### Conclusion

During former AIAMs this working group has mainly discussed the feasibility of lowering thresholds. I am happy to report that this year’s discussion was broader in scope. Many important suggestions were made. As could be expected, there was no unified view. Nevertheless, I think there is reason to believe that the discussion has given some food for thought that might be of importance during the revision of the Vienna Document.

WORKING GROUP III

Tuesday, 3 March 1998

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (d): compliance and verification
- 

Original: GERMAN

1. Experience with the application of evaluation visits and inspections in accordance with the Vienna Document 1994 provided the basis for discussion in the Working Group. Once again generally positive feedback on verification was received from numerous States, although evident weaknesses were also mentioned. As in previous years the dominant topic was the fact that certain countries were rapidly using up their evaluation quotas right at the beginning of the year.

2. Mention was made at the outset of the improved and balanced implementation by more participating States and the intensification of activities between neighbours.

The possibility of multinational evaluations and inspections was acknowledged by several participants as an appropriate way of

- increasing the number of countries involved,
- enhancing the significance of the Vienna Document and
- compensating to some extent for the inadequate quota for evaluations.

3. A large number of States mentioned the basic need for adaptation, definition and clearer formulation of the Vienna Document 1994 to ensure that it remained effective and to further increase its significance as a confidence- and security-building instrument.

4. The following problem areas were specifically identified:

The evaluation quotas are used up too early in the year and are still calculated on the basis of the situation prevailing when the Vienna Document first entered into force.

Several countries made specific proposals or repeated suggestions from previous years.

There was general agreement that a solution to this central weakness in the verification process was urgently required.

The following proposals were made:

- Doubling or increasing the minimum quotas for evaluations and adapting the basis for calculation;
- Spreading of quotas over the entire calendar year;
- Conversion of inspection quotas into evaluation quotas and spreading them over the entire year;
- Modification of the basis for calculating quotas, e.g. from 60 troop units to 30 troop units;
- Increase in the number of members of evaluation teams;
- Intensification/increase of multinational measures;
- Use of a country's inspection quotas for evaluations;
- Notification/authorization of additional voluntary quotas;
- Regional agreements with neighbouring States on additional evaluation quotas;
- Limitation of the obligation to accept verification visits to a maximum of one per month.

The proposals met with different reactions during the discussion. Some countries referred to the significance and value of the different purposes underlying inspection and evaluation and rejected the idea of combining these different activities, for security reasons among other things. The Working Group was largely unanimous in supporting the following proposals:

- An increase of evaluation quotas in principle;
- Allotment/distribution of quotas over the calendar year and limitation of the measures to be carried out during particular periods (e.g. per month, per quarter).

The other proposals were generally considered to be worthy of discussion.

Reference was made, as in previous years, to the possibility that rising costs would complicate the implementation of proposals. Possible co-ordination of quotas through the CPC was also mentioned, but on the other hand national responsibility for implementation, which virtually excludes any superordinate control, was pointed out as a difficulty. Increasing the number of members of evaluation teams was regarded as an inappropriate and unduly expensive measure and again rejected by some delegations.

In the discussion many participating States expressed regret about the quota competition and supported, in their proposals, the need to find a solution acceptable to all - a solution which, despite a general increase in evaluation quotas, would nevertheless limit



costs. The proposal regarding quota allotment was supported as a first and particularly urgent step.

5. Additional proposals of participating States:

- Notification deadlines generally to be respected in accordance with the document. The element of surprise should not be weakened by excessive generosity (No. 84);
- Specified areas for inspections to be defined more accurately in size, and the size to be limited (No. 78);
- Access to barracks and/or infrastructure to be guaranteed, sensitive areas to be kept to a minimum in order to ensure transparency (No. 79);
- Additional guidelines regarding content and format for reporting, in order to give all participating States a clear picture of the activity carried out and enable everyone to verify whether the provisions of VD 94 have been complied with; changes in or deviations from notified personnel or equipment strength to be stated (No. 103);
- Auxiliary personnel authorized to participate in inspections to be clearly indicated so that interpreters can be included in the inspection tours (No. 89/90);
- The list of permissible auxiliary means to be expanded to include SATCOM and GPS (No. 93);
- In verification exercises it should be possible to ask questions about national implementation of the Code of Conduct, and these questions are to be answered.

6. Within the framework of the Working Group, Hungary offered participating States four additional evaluation quotas for 1998 as well - also a contribution and an example of the way in which the quota situation could be improved.

Ukraine announced a regional agreement on additional quotas with Romania and Hungary, in line with the exemplary practice adopted in other parts of Europe.

7. Summing up, one must say that, given the enhanced implementation of verification measures, the unsatisfactory quota arrangements are all the more urgently in need of improvement.

Many countries described the proposals that had been put forward as a sound basis for further concrete efforts in Working Group A (or in the FSC) to improve implementation in line with the generally successful application of VD 94 so far.

WORKING GROUP IV

Tuesday, 3 March 1998

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:

(e): risk reduction

---

The discussion centred on the measure concerning “unusual military activities”. It was noted that no recourse to this measure had been registered in 1997. All delegations commenting on this fact assessed it positively as a clear sign of the improved security situation in the area of application.

It appears that the measure in its present form continues to be a useful tool. Taking into account the developments that have occurred since the measure was drafted, however, in particular the co-operative approach the OSCE has increasingly adopted in dealing with crisis situations, there is still room for improvements of the kind recently proposed by three delegations, for example.

The comparative merits of applying the measures at regional or OSCE-wide level were also briefly discussed and differing views emerged. The measures concerning “hazardous incidents” were also touched on and it was noted that not all participating States had complied with the obligation to designate a Point of Contact.

## WORKING GROUP IV

Tuesday, 3 March 1998

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:

(f): contacts

---

The working session took as its point of departure the present state of affairs as set out in the CPC surveys on contacts in 1997 and 1998. As the activity described in these surveys was rather limited - mainly visits to air bases, visits to military facilities etc., (§ 30.3) and demonstrations of major new weapons systems (§§ 31-35) - delegations were encouraged to inform the working group of other contacts that had been made, though not reported to the CPC.

The subsequent debate revealed that a wide variety of contacts - some on a bilateral basis - had actually taken place or were planned for this year. A number of countries (UK, USA, Bulgaria, Turkey, Poland, Hungary and Italy) announced that invitations were to be distributed in the near future. Hungary elaborated on the recently signed bilateral agreement with the Slovak Republic on mutual extra-VD CSBMs. Others (Switzerland, Germany) provided information on contacts, such as exchange of students at military academies, schools and training centres, language training, that had been arranged bilaterally.

A few suggestions were also made. Germany would like to see the CPC receive and distribute information on all visits to air bases prior to their execution and further encouraged delegations to utilize their F 22 forms to inform recipients whether contacts were obligatory or of a voluntary nature. Switzerland suggested not only that host country participants should prepare for their planned contacts, but also that guests should be selected on the basis of their knowledge of the kind of event taking place, local issues in the host country and linguistic abilities.

The working session left the impression that, in the spirit of the Vienna Document, contacts were flourishing in almost every corner of the ATTU.

WORKING GROUP V

Monday, 2 March 1998

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinators

- Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (g): communications
- 

ISSUES FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT

The essential role of the OSCE network in implementing the provisions of the Vienna Document was emphasized. The Delegation of Sweden reiterated its point of view that non-connection to the network was non-compliance.

Although delegations showed scepticism about an early involvement of experts in the process of adaptation of the Vienna Document in the field of communication, it was recognized that timely input of expert knowledge and experience would be required. One delegation underlined that involvement of experts should take place basically in the capitals of the participating States.

The suggestion of granting a limited budget to the Communications Group found no support. Some delegations stated that support would be given if the Communications Group could justify its requirements. In this discussion the Delegation of Sweden suggested that the Communications Network be brought directly under the authority of the FSC.

Delegations emphasized that compliance by the participants with the Standard Operating Procedures would improve the proper functioning of the network. It was pointed out that in some cases where messages with dual precedence (high priority for the action addressee and normal priority for all other addressees) were sent, the directives in the Standard Operating Procedures were not being executed correctly.

In the discussion on the need for modernization of the OSCE network favourable arguments were summed up by the Delegation of the United States of America.

The German Delegation suggested that the participants of the AIAM would benefit from a status report provided by a representative of the Communications Group in advance of the working group discussions.

The co-ordinator wishes to express his thanks to the members of the participating delegations for their valuable contributions.

## WORKING GROUP VI

Wednesday, 4 March 1998

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 3: Operation and implementation of other agreed measures/documents - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- Global Exchange of Military Information;
  - Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers;
  - Principles Governing Non-proliferation;
  - Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations;
  - CSBMs Stemming from Regional and Subregional Arrangements;
  - Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security
- 

#### Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI)

Sweden and Germany provided detailed reports and recommendations based on their analysis of three years of data exchanged under this agreement. They both drew particular attention to discrepancies in reporting on personnel strength, especially in the categories of “authorized” and “actual” figures.

Ukraine, speaking also on behalf of Moldova, Georgia and Azerbaijan, described a recently tabled proposal in the FSC about refining the language of the preamble to report GEMI information by State in the OSCE area.

#### Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers

The UK, speaking on behalf of the EU, welcomed FSC Decision No. 13/97 under which participating States are to exchange information provided in the UN Register of Conventional Arms among themselves. Turkey recommended that the CPC add a column to the table in the survey to reflect submissions made in accordance with this Decision.

Canada spoke positively of the responses to the Questionnaire on National Practices, and recalled the proposal made by its Foreign Minister at the Copenhagen Ministerial Council for an initiative to address the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. Turkey and Germany spoke in support of the Canadian proposal.

The Netherlands noted similar concerns regarding illicit arms trafficking.

### Principles Governing Non-Proliferation

Spain noted that many of the principles have been either implemented or otherwise dealt with in recent years and suggested that an effort should be made to bring the document up to date with the current situation in respect of multilateral non-proliferation issues.

Germany described several of the steps it had taken in relation to non-proliferation issues, and highlighted the agreement on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Germany also made an appeal for additional signatures to the NPT Treaty and expressed the hope that progress would be made on a Fissile Material Ban in the near future.

### Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations

Italy gave a short review of how these measures had been taken into consideration during the formulation of the Dayton Annex 1B, Article II agreement and described how they had been discussed during the recently held Review Conference for Article II. It noted the potential for inclusion of the document in a revised version of the Vienna Document or at least for keeping the measures as a catalogue for future use.

Armenia supported inclusion of these measures in the Vienna Document and described how they had been used in monitoring the ceasefire of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. It emphasized the need for full involvement of all parties in a conflict to attain tangible results using the measures and noted that they could be profitably applied in other areas as well, such as humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping.

Russia stressed the value of the document but questioned whether it should become a separate chapter in the Vienna Document and, specifically, whether such action would alter the status of the document in some way. Italy commented on the application of the measures in the context of a potential new chapter dealing with regional issues.

### CSBMs stemming from regional and subregional arrangements

Sweden made a statement concerning its military activities with several Baltic partners. Poland announced an invitation for a naval base visit in September, to which the same modalities would apply as to Vienna Document events.

The Netherlands spoke again of its proposal for a “menu” of measures for use on a regional or subregional basis.

Ukraine, speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, the Russian Federation and Turkey, described the agreement reached ten days earlier to begin negotiations on Naval CSBMs in the Black Sea. Negotiations are to begin next month and will be conducted outside existing international fora. Additional briefings on the progress of the negotiations will be provided in due course.

Lithuania informed delegates that non-military co-operation was well developed, and asked that the FSC take into account the co-operation that had already taken place, with reference to an EAPC briefing held in Brussels this week. It further requested that the FSC avoid unnecessary competition with other ongoing programmes that provide for co-operation in the region. Stress was laid on the fact that there were no military problems in the Baltic

area requiring CSBM action at the present time. Regional co-operation should strengthen the European landscape, not fragment it, and military CSBMs should retain an OSCE universal application. The OSCE might develop an illustrative list of measures for use on a regional basis, but it would ultimately be up to the participating States to determine whether they wished to consider applying such measures to their own regions.

Germany spoke in support of the Netherlands proposal for a menu of CSBMs and was encouraged to know that regional dialogue would feature prominently in the coming months of discussion on Vienna Document revision. It cautioned against any interpretation of “fragmentation” with respect to further development of CSBMs for regional or subregional purposes.

Switzerland welcomed Lithuania’s conclusion that there were no military concerns in the region, but regretted the suggestion that Vienna Document regional measures could be seen as competing with other forms of co-operation. It specifically questioned whether a market existed for further work on regional CSBMs, and expressed doubts about supplying an unnecessary product.

Latvia also perceived the Netherlands proposal as creating competition with existing forms of co-operation. It questioned whether the OSCE needed to work in this area, and distinguished two types of States involved in the process: those speaking about prescribing regional CSBMs that did not consider themselves part of a region; and those that considered themselves part of a region and capable of assessing the situation and seeking CSBMs if necessary. Latvia felt it was up to the countries of the region to say whether CSBMs were needed or not, and while suggestions were welcome, the final judgement regarding their use lay with individual States.

### Code of Conduct

Greece provided a statement on several steps it had taken in implementing the Code of Conduct, including legal mechanisms and seminars. France also described its recent efforts to disseminate the Code of Conduct throughout its military establishment.

Canada welcomed the EU statement at the opening plenary, and spoke in support of further steps to adopt the questionnaire developed by the CPC after the September Follow-up Conference. It was planning to table a new version of the questionnaire with emphasis on a user-friendly approach, and to seek FSC approval for exchanging this information in an obligatory fashion, rather than just on a voluntary basis.

Germany also supported the EU statement, welcomed the Canadian initiative on the questionnaire, and offered assistance to any State requesting further guidance on practical steps that could be taken to implement the Code.

Turkey questioned using Vienna Document evaluation visits as a mechanism for verifying implementation of the Code, and cautioned against mixing the implementation of a CSBM with a Norm and Standard Setting Measure (NSSM) document. It suggested using the next conference in 1999 to discuss verification mechanisms. It also supported further work on the questionnaire.

The Russian Federation expressed doubts about formulating a verification mechanism, and believed the document already contained certain relevant provisions for that purpose. It also supported the voluntary principle of implementation.

Switzerland and Sweden both spoke in support of using Vienna Document inspections and evaluations as an opportunity to discuss implementation of the Code of Conduct with troops. They saw no reason why participating States should not avail themselves of these opportunities to discuss the Code of Conduct as one means of furthering dialogue on the subject. They also supported further work on the questionnaire and discussion on other mechanisms for verification.

\* \* \* \* \*

In closing, all participating States agreed that the Vienna Document 1994 AIAM provided a useful opportunity to conduct an implementation review of these agreements/measures. All agreed that these documents remain vital components of the Framework of agreements adopted by the FSC, and complement the Vienna Document 1994 CSBMs.



ANNEX



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

FSC.DEC/2/98  
18 February 1998

Original: ENGLISH

---

**209th Plenary Meeting**

FSC Journal No. 215, Agenda item 2

**DECISION No. 2/98**

**ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING  
2-4 March 1998**

I. AGENDA

1. Opening of the Meeting by the Chairman - Report of the Chairman of the FSC on CSBM implementation issues discussed in the FSC during 1997 - Situation report by the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre on the follow-up to AIAM 1997 - General remarks
2. Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Document 1994 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
  - (a) annual exchange of military information;
  - (b) defence planning;
  - (c) military activities:
    - prior notification of certain military activities;
    - observation of certain military activities;
    - annual calendars;
    - constraining provisions;
  - (d) compliance and verification;
  - (e) risk reduction;
  - (f) contacts;
  - (g) communications.

3. Operation and implementation of other agreed measures/documents - assessment, clarification and conclusions:

- Global Exchange of Military Information;
- Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers;
- Principles Governing Non-proliferation;
- Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations;
- CSBMs Stemming from Regional and Subregional Arrangements;
- Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security.

4. Concluding remarks

5. Date of the 1999 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting

6. Closure of the Meeting

## II. TIMETABLE AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES

1. The AIAM will be organized into opening and closing plenary meetings, and Working Group meetings to address different portions of the agenda. The indicative timetable in the Annex provides more detail.

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

Interpretation into the OSCE official languages will be provided.

2. The Chair for the meeting will be held in rotation among the delegates in French alphabetical order, proceeding from the Chair for the last day of the 1997 AIAM (Norway). On 2 March the Chair will be the Netherlands; on 4 March the Chair will be Poland.

3. There will be no formal statements in the Working Groups.

All delegations are strongly encouraged to provide experts to participate in these informal meetings. The more experts present from a variety of countries, the more useful and informative the AIAM will be. Working Groups are designed to be very informal sessions with the dual objective of answering questions and exchanging information between States.

4. Each Working Group will have a designated Co-ordinator. The Co-ordinator's duties will be to facilitate the discussion and to make an oral report during the closing plenary.

If possible, the Co-ordinator will circulate a list of discussion questions or topics prior to his or her session to help guide the discussion and ensure that all relevant areas are addressed.

During the first part of the closing plenary meeting, the Co-ordinator of each Working Group will provide a short oral report to the delegates on the issues that the Working Group has addressed, including problem areas, improvements achieved, suggestions for further improvement and any other pertinent information. After each oral report, the Co-ordinator will answer questions. Delegations are encouraged to comment on or add to the Co-ordinator's report.

The Co-ordinator is also strongly encouraged to provide written input to the CPC for inclusion in a survey of suggestions made during the AIAM aiming at improvement of the implementation of CSBMs and in a written summary having informal status.

Delegations that have volunteers for the role of Working Group Co-ordinator should provide the name of the individual and Working Group number to the Chairman of the FSC as soon as possible, but not later than 20 February. A Working Group may have more than one Co-ordinator. The Co-ordinator for each Working Group will be made known to all delegations not later than 25 February.

5. Pertinent additional areas relating to CSBMs can be considered for discussion. All delegations are strongly encouraged to propose topics and provide experts from their countries. Delegations that wish to suggest additional areas for discussion in the Working Groups should contact the Chairman of the FSC not later than 20 February.

Delegations are strongly encouraged to provide detailed explanations and concrete examples of their own implementation procedures as appropriate.

6. Within one month of the conclusion of the AIAM, the CPC will provide a survey of suggestions made during the Meeting aiming at improvement of the implementation of CSBMs and a written summary having informal status.

7. During the first FSC plenary meeting after the conclusion of the AIAM, the Chairman will submit a report to the FSC on the AIAM.

8. The Mediterranean partners for co-operation and Japan, as well as the Republic of Korea, are invited to attend the opening and closing plenary meetings of the 1998 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting.

**ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING  
2-4 March 1998**

**INDICATIVE TIMETABLE**

*Note: All times are indicative. The Chair or Co-ordinator can change times as necessary to ensure the best possible use of all available time.*

Monday, 2 March

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| 9 a.m.          | Organizational meeting (for Chairpersons, etc.)   |
| 10 a.m.         | Opening plenary - Report of the Chairman of the FSC on CSBM implementation issues discussed in the FSC during 1997 - Situation report by the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre on the follow-up to AIAM 1997 - General remarks |
| 1 p.m.          | Lunch break   |
| 3 p.m. - 4 p.m. | Working Group I - Agenda item 2(a) - annual exchange of military information  |
| 4 p.m. - 5 p.m. | Working Group II - Agenda item 2(b) - defence planning  |
| 5 p.m. - 6 p.m. | Working Group V - Agenda item 2(g) - communications   |
| 6 p.m.          | Meeting adjourns  |

Tuesday, 3 March

- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| 10 a.m.           | Working Group III - Agenda items 2(c) and 2(d) |
| 10 a.m. - 12 noon | military activities                            |
| 12 noon - 1 p.m.  | compliance and verification                    |
| 1 p.m.            | Lunch break                                    |
| 3 p.m. - 4 p.m.   | compliance and verification                    |
| 4 p.m.            | Working Group IV - Agenda items 2(e) and 2(f)  |
| 4 p.m. - 5 p.m.   | risk reduction                                 |
| 5 p.m. - 6 p.m.   | contacts                                       |
| 6 p.m.            | Meeting adjourns                               |

Wednesday, 4 March

- 10 a.m. Working Group VI - Agenda item 3
- 10 a.m. - 11.30 a.m. Operation and implementation of other agreed measures/documents - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- Global Exchange of Military Information;
  - Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers;
  - Principles Governing Non-proliferation;
  - Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations;
  - CSBMs stemming from regional and subregional arrangements;
- 11.30 a.m. - 1 p.m. - Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security.
- 1 p.m. Lunch break
- 3 p.m. Closing plenary (Agenda items 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6)
- Summary of working group meetings
  - Discussion
  - Concluding remarks
  - Date of the 1999 AIAM
  - Closure
- 6 p.m. 1998 AIAM adjourns