



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

1996 REVIEW MEETING

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE TO THE
LISBON SUMMIT**

**(including the Reports of the Rapporteurs of the
Working Groups)**

Lisbon, 29 November 1996

REF.S/91/96
29 November 1996

Original: ENGLISH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. GENERAL.....	1
II. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS	
(a) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the politico-military aspects of security (Working Group 1(a), Rapporteur Mr. Nicolas Mettra)	2
(b) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic dimension (Working Group 1(b), Rapporteur Mr. Emil Yalnazov)	10
(c) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the human dimension (Working Group 1(c), Rapporteur Mr. Keith Morrill).....	17
III. REVIEW OF OSCE ACTIVITIES, INSTITUTIONS, STRUCTURES AND INSTRUMENTS, INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE THE ROLE OF THE OSCE AND FURTHER STRENGTHEN ITS CAPABILITIES (Working Group 2, Rapporteur Mr. Sture Theolin).....	24
ANNEX AGENDA, ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK, TIMETABLE AND OTHER MODALITIES OF THE 1996 REVIEW MEETING AND THE PREPARATORY MEETING TO THE LISBON SUMMIT (PC.DEC/137)	34

REVIEW MEETING 1996

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE TO THE LISBON SUMMIT

I. GENERAL

The 1996 Review Meeting of the OSCE took place from 4 to 22 November in Vienna, on the basis of Decision No. 137 (19 September 1996, see annex) of the Permanent Council, establishing the agenda, the organizational framework as well as the timetable and other modalities.

The participating States, the Mediterranean partners for co-operation and the partners for co-operation took part in the Review Meeting. International organizations and institutions, namely the Council of Europe, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Western European Union, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Commonwealth of Independent States, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, International Committee of the Red Cross, World Bank, United Nations Development Programme, and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, participated in the Review Meeting in the Plenary or in appropriate sessions of the Working Groups in the context of relevant items. A considerable number of non-governmental organizations attended and contributed to the sessions of the Working Groups open to them.

The Review Meeting held five plenary meetings and proceeded in 33 sessions in two Working Groups both to a thorough review of implementation of all OSCE principles and commitments and to a review of OSCE activities, institutions, structures and instruments, including consideration of proposals designed to enhance the role of the OSCE and further strengthen its capabilities.

The present report sets out the main findings and recommendations of the Meeting. Inevitably, not all points of view could be reflected in this report. However, there is a wealth of documents that have been circulated during the Review Meeting and that can, in addition, serve as a complement.

The Chairman-in-Office suggests that points commanding wide support be taken up by the Permanent Council and other organs and institutions of the OSCE.

The Chairman-in-Office finally wants to thank the rapporteurs, Mr. Nicolas Mettra for Working Group 1(a), Mr. Emil Yalnazov for Working Group 1(b), Mr. Keith Morrill for Working Group 1(c) and Mr. Sture Theolin for Working Group 2, for their efforts to report on the essential points covered in their Groups. The following parts of the present report are their reports to the Chairman-in-Office.

Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE

Flavio Cotti
Federal Councillor
Head of the Federal Department
of Foreign Affairs

II. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS

- (a) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the politico-military aspects of security

Report of Working Group 1(a) Rapporteur Mr. Nicolas Mettra

I. The first meeting, on Tuesday, 12 November, was devoted to a review of the Code of Conduct. A large number of delegations spoke during the discussion.

Review of commitments

It was noted that information on the implementation by States of the commitments they had subscribed to under the Code was still incomplete. One delegation mentioned that only 24 States had provided the OSCE with information, and in some cases the information had been perfunctory. Attention was drawn to a number of violations of the provisions of paragraph 36 of the Code, and clarification as provided for in paragraph 38 of the Code was requested. By contrast, one delegation pointed out that there had been no violations of the provisions of paragraph 31.

A number of delegations described the way in which the Code had been incorporated in their national legislation, emphasizing the section relating to “democratic control of military forces”. Others said that they would be willing to provide information at the meeting if requested to do so, but this offer was not taken up.

Stress was also laid on the unique position of each country as regards implementation of the Code, a situation created by varying levels of “democratic development”. According to one delegation, it was important to take a positive approach and to consider ways in which participating States could co-operate with each other in difficult implementation situations.

In one delegation’s view, implementation of the Code was a complex task involving both the civilian population and the military forces; the country in question had yet to complete this demanding work.

Many delegations emphasized with appreciation the beneficial role played by the information seminars on the Code of Conduct organized for the benefit of military forces by Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden.

One delegation exercised its right of reply in order to rectify comments made by another delegation about violation of the provisions of paragraph 36.

Other delegations emphasized the global nature of the document; while the section relating to democratic control of military forces was important, the relevance of the Code as a general framework for European security should not be underestimated. Some delegations highlighted the political function of this instrument - reference base for the OSCE security space, symbol of communality of ideas, cornerstone in the democratic construction of the participating States. They also emphasized the importance of the Code as an early-warning instrument.

One delegation stressed the principle of solidarity, and another mentioned the principle of sufficiency, while a third was concerned that the review framework should be restricted to the specific provisions set forth in the Code.

Proposals for improving implementation

One delegation emphasized that, as the Code was a recently adopted document, time should be allowed for implementing and perhaps even refining it.

Monitoring of its implementation was considered to be important in view of the role devolving on each of the participating States in that connection. It was suggested that improvements could be achieved through:

- the Annual Implementation Assessment Meetings (AIAMs), even if their usefulness were limited by the large number of subjects tackled and the shortage of time;
- the holding of familiarization seminars;
- the provision of more detailed information about how the Code was being incorporated into domestic administrative law and practice;
- the holding of a high-level follow-up conference in 1997 (this proposal was supported by many delegations, although differing views were expressed as to the conference's scope and the level of participation);
- utilization of the various OSCE instruments and mechanisms in verifying implementation of the Code's provisions;
- the creation of a new instrument for monitoring implementation of the Code within the OSCE framework.

On a personal note, the Rapporteur appreciated the active participation of delegations and the large number of proposals made with a view to improving compliance with the provisions of the Code; no delegation denied the need for improvement. It was regrettable that delegations had not supplied more details about the specific modalities for implementing the Code within their domestic legal systems. At the end of the exercise, it was clear that the OSCE and its various bodies should make better use of the Code of Conduct, which was such a versatile instrument.

II. The Vienna Document 1994 was reviewed during the second meeting, on Monday, 18 November. A large number of delegations spoke during the discussion.

Review of commitments

It was noted that some of the work of reviewing commitments was done within the framework of the AIAMs. Delegations therefore concentrated on identifying the most important elements, referring in matters of detail to the conclusions reached by them at the most recent AIAM.

A number of delegations expressed general satisfaction with the implementation of the Vienna Document. Despite this positive assessment, however, certain shortcomings were pointed out:

- some participating States had not yet given the envisaged notifications, although the number of such States was declining from year to year;
- not enough States were yet participating in inspections, visits, contacts and other co-operative mechanisms;
- the communications network provided for in the Vienna Document, the importance of which was stressed by many delegations, did not yet link all capitals of participating States.

Besides such cases of non-implementation, there were deficiencies attributable to the Vienna Document itself and to the ways in which it was interpreted by States:

- Were the provisions of the Vienna Document merely “fair-weather” provisions applicable only in the absence of tensions or crises? The vast majority of the delegations which spoke on this point considered them to be “all-weather” provisions. One delegation stated that the provisions were adequate as long as the political will to apply them existed. It was perhaps regrettable that, in the case considered, inspections had been carried out only in non-conflict areas. However, as another delegation emphasized, account should be taken of the risks inherent in conducting inspections in conflict areas and of the additional security burden for the receiving country. There was reference to the need to devise specific measures applicable in times of crisis, but also to the difficulty of devising such measures in practice.
- Some provisions of the Vienna Document had scarcely been applied to date - for example the provisions relating to “risk reduction”. Although this was regretted by some delegations, few reasons were advanced to explain it.
- It was also noted that insufficient attention was being paid to regional aspects. While some delegations noted shortcomings in this respect, others drew attention to the difficulties of providing a specific response. Some delegations called for full application of the existing provisions of the Document.

Other delegations, however, felt that the Document had more serious weaknesses. The number of notifications of manoeuvres was in fact diminishing from year to year, evidence enough that the relevant provisions no longer corresponded to the present situation in Europe as regards security. The Preamble of the Document reproduced the Madrid mandate, which reflected an era of bloc-to-bloc confrontation now relegated to the past. On this point, however, one delegation replied that the mandate was the fruit of complex negotiations, some elements of which were still relevant.

Proposals for improving implementation

Depending on the importance attached to adaptation of the Document to current security requirements, the improvement proposals made by delegations ranged from proposals for selective, limited measures to proposals for more substantial reforms. However, delegations agreed in emphasizing the general importance of the Document for the achievement of transparency, predictability and co-operation among the armed forces of the participating States.

A number of proposals were made for improving the implementation of the Document's existing provisions - for example, a more systematic application of OSCE procedures and mechanisms in order to promote full compliance by States experiencing implementation difficulties. One delegation suggested that the Liaison Office in Central Asia be used for that purpose, while others suggested that OSCE Missions be assigned a follow-up role in politico-military matters. The usefulness of harmonizing information exchange modalities was also stressed, one delegation suggesting the creation of a reference document - a kind of "White Book" - as a model.

In addition, it was suggested that compliance with the Document's provisions be assessed not once a year or even once a month, as was the case with Working Group A of the Forum, but constantly by a permanent working group, possibly - in one delegation's view - guided by the Secretariat.

One delegation even suggested that sanctions be considered in cases of non-compliance.

Some delegations urged that better use be made of the potential offered by the section devoted to visits and contacts, an increase in the frequency of which would in itself be a confidence-building measure.

Among the proposals made regarding future measures there was one for broadening the scope of the Vienna Document so as to include naval operations and paramilitary and internal security forces. However, the lively discussion prompted by these two subjects revealed a lack of agreement on such proposals. It was suggested that the thresholds be lowered and that specific provisions be included for peacekeeping operations.

Some delegations called for a new generation of confidence-building measures to take account in particular of the new security situation in Europe and the challenges posed by the proliferation of regional conflicts. Others emphasized the importance of implementing the existing documents.

On a personal note, the Rapporteur concluded from the intensive and substantive discussion that there was a considerable interest in updating the provisions of the Vienna Document. By contrast, opinions differed as to the desired outcome - for example, should the outcome be a completely new Vienna Document? This option was not yet supported by all delegations. Also, several delegations stated that the general balance of the Vienna Document was linked to a certain extent to that of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces: ultimately, the process of adaptation initiated by the States Party to the Treaty could not but have an impact on the Vienna Document.

III. The third meeting, on Tuesday, 19 November, was devoted to the three other documents adopted by the Forum and mentioned in the Annex to Chapter 5 of the Budapest Document and to regional problems.

Review of commitments pertaining to the documents

The **Global Exchange of Military Information** gave rise to relatively little discussion. Implementation was considered to be satisfactory, although it was felt that there was room for improvement. One delegation stressed the difficulties involved in applying the document - for example, the question of deadlines for submitting information and overlaps with the Vienna Document. Would it be better to harmonize the notification dates provided

for in the two documents, or simply to incorporate the global exchange document into the Vienna Document? This question, posed by one delegation, was not discussed.

The **Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers** were examined. Several delegations spoke on the subject. Among the implementation measures taken, the value of a seminar held in 1995 and that of the questionnaire addressed to participating States were mentioned by some delegations. Regret was expressed at the lack of follow-up to the seminar. One delegation proposed forging ahead with the process set in motion by the Principles, care being taken to avoid overlapping with procedures such as those associated with the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. Other delegations, however, considered that the present framework already constituted an important element and that its provisions should be respected - particularly Section I, which sets out the criteria to be respected by States. One delegation pointed to the difficulty of taking into account the criterion regarding human rights in difficult economic situations which encourage the development of arms exports.

In the view of one delegation, the Forum was not competent to deal with arms export questions.

The document on **Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations** was then discussed. A number of delegations spoke on the subject. It was pointed out that the document had been used only once. This virtual non-use was attributed to a lack of political will but one delegation blamed it on weaknesses in the document, which did not arrange the proposed measures in any kind of hierarchy and, failing to distinguish between the political and the technical, was too ambitious. A brief discussion ensued on the extent to which a general framework could be applied to a specific situation in negotiations aimed at resolving a crisis, reference being made to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. If the text was ever reviewed, it should be made more precise and less ambitious, even if there was real scope for development.

Review of commitments relating to regional situations

Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina was the subject of intensive debate. The Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on the implementation of Article II of that annex, Ambassador Krasznai, reported on his activities. The agreement reached by the Parties in January 1996 was being implemented: the inspection programme was proceeding as foreseen, subject to the difficulties inherent in the situation. Success depended on several factors: mobilization of the international community, expressed especially by the presence of IFOR troops, and, recently at the political level, at the Paris meeting of the Ministerial Steering Board, by the full involvement of the OSCE. This environment guaranteed the effectiveness of the military confidence-building measures. Consideration should be given to the adoption of a long-term approach and to the gradual inculcation of a disarmament culture. At the local level, in both the political and the military sphere, there was a clear desire to rejoin the "European family", and the best possible use should be made of that desire. As the IFOR presence was reduced, the arms control measures would have to be stepped up, which would call for a network of contacts between the military forces of countries of the OSCE community and those of the authorities in Bosnia. In the short term, it was essential to dissociate the confidence-building measures from the ups and downs of the political situation and at the same time, as far as the international community was concerned, to incorporate those measures into the totality of actions being taken by it at the economic and political levels.

The Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on the implementation of Article IV, Ambassador Eide, then shared his thoughts at the end of five months spent in implementing the Florence Agreement. He stressed the need for general co-ordination of the international community's resources: the Article II process and the Article IV process each had specific features, and there was both a link and major differences between the two. The extent of implementation of that Agreement varied from party to party as regards both inspections and reductions. It was necessary to remind the Parties constantly of their commitments and demonstrate the international community's determination to ensure that they were complied with. It was important to combine measures of dissuasion and of persuasion, in particular through the continuation of diversified assistance in the field of arms control. It was also important to demonstrate patience and stamina. The Article V negotiations would be equally important and complex.

Some delegations emphasized the very specific nature of the Bosnian situation, the lessons from which were difficult to apply to other situations. One delegation stated that security was not the same everywhere and that, consequently, it was for the States most involved to define their security needs themselves; the danger of fragmentation was averted as soon as common instruments of proven soundness were used.

It was also pointed out that regional negotiations were not necessarily associated with a crisis situation but could also play a preventive role as part of an overall strategy involving many aspects of co-operation. It was further noted that the regional approach should not be treated as a substitute for the right of each State to undertake its own security commitments.

Efforts to implement the commitments undertaken in respect of regional initiatives since Budapest had not been successful. As a number of delegations pointed out, there was a problem of defining the region and the measures to be taken: the regional approach should not become an excuse for a policy of domination. Furthermore, it was important to maintain a proper balance between the regional approach and the general framework. This was demonstrated by the case of Bosnia, where instruments of broad scope such as the Vienna Document and the CFE Treaty had served as examples in drafting the negotiated agreements.

In the Rapporteur's personal opinion, the debate on the three documents remained at a more general level than had been the case in the discussions on the Vienna Document. It was thus more difficult to draw practical conclusions from them. The very ample discussion on the regional approach showed that a great deal of work remained to be done before an agreed conceptual framework could be produced - but that work was essential.

IV. The fourth meeting reviewed the work of the Forum for Security Co-operation, commitments related to the war on terrorism, principles relating to non-proliferation, and the dialogue on security.

Review of the work of the Forum

A number of delegations presented a highly critical account of the Forum's modest achievements since the Budapest Summit. Over a period of nearly two years, the Forum - even though it had held three useful and interesting seminars and pursued its study of implementation in an efficient manner - had not succeeded in producing a single agreed document. Many delegations felt that the reason for this was the absence of any definite programme. An important task for Lisbon, therefore, was to adopt a programme which would enable the Forum to accomplish its mission and respond to the new challenges. At all events, the failures of the Forum should not be ascribed to its methods of work. The Forum

was, after all, only the sum total of the States represented in it and the vital political impulse was often missing.

One delegation felt that the new programme should take account of the new security deal in Europe. Furthermore, the programme defined in Helsinki should be executed in full, particularly through development of the Vienna Document, the definition of regional measures and the elaboration of an appropriate response to the new risks that had arisen.

One delegation felt that the reason for the Forum's weakness should perhaps be sought in the very rapid evolution of the security situation in the OSCE space. The new programme should take due account of this situation in confronting largely unpredictable future developments, and should be suitably flexible in its approach. Another delegation stressed the influence of as yet unresolved questions in the new strategic context of the Euro-Atlantic space. Yet other delegations believed that the difficulties of the Forum might be due to the existence of a parallel debate on the security model, the fact that an approach based on transparency and candour was developing progressively on the basis of already agreed documents, thus making new instruments less necessary.

The need to strengthen the dialogue on security in the Forum was likewise stressed, as was the value of regular, substantive information on the state of negotiations in other OSCE-related fora. It was suggested that for these purposes the work of the Permanent Council should be more closely co-ordinated with that of the Forum, duplication naturally being avoided.

Principles governing non-proliferation

There was little discussion. One delegation welcomed the entry into force of the Convention on Chemical Weapons. Another stressed the importance of the commitments undertaken by OSCE countries to encourage universal accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Mention was also made of the discussions in progress within the Forum on the subject of anti-personnel landmines.

The war on terrorism

The commitments undertaken in this respect were examined - commitments involving, primarily, co-operation between OSCE States. One delegation felt that the OSCE had done little in this sphere and suggested that a workshop on terrorism should be held. This proposal was supported by a number of delegations, with the proviso that there was no duplication of the work done in other fora. The importance of the subject was stressed by another delegation, which recalled the various proposals tabled on the subject in the course of the year. One delegation expressed the opinion that the OSCE was clearly not the most appropriate forum for this subject.

The dialogue on security

Several delegations felt that this dialogue had been inadequate. One delegation underlined the need for adequate staffing to maintain an appropriate analytical capacity in security matters. The Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), despite its redoubtable efficiency, could not take over that role. It was thus important to make the best possible use of synergy with competent research institutes, while keeping public opinion informed. A certain number of delegations felt that analytical work of this type should remain the province of States

themselves and need not involve NGOs, although an enhanced CPC role in the provision of support or assistance could well be considered, for States that desired it.

More generally, it would be important to enter into a more serious dialogue, through more careful co-ordination with the work of the Permanent Council on the one hand, but also through broader exchanges of views on questions of a political and military nature.

The personal opinion of the Rapporteur is that the lively debate that arose on the tasks and duties of the Forum, in the light of the three subjects considered, was rich and rewarding. It brought to light undeniable differences of opinion, but it also led to one clear conclusion: the Forum had been unable to fulfil its mission completely, and it would be up to Lisbon to remedy that situation, bearing in mind the new elements of security in Europe to which this important OSCE body ought to make its contribution.

(b) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic dimension

Report of Working Group 1(b) Rapporteur Mr. Emil Yalnazov

The discussion in Working Group 1(b) opened with a review of implementation of commitments on economic co-operation contained in relevant OSCE documents. In this respect the conclusions of the OSCE Economic Dimension Implementation Review Meeting, held in Geneva on 22 and 23 January 1996 were duly noted. Delegations dwelled on positive and negative examples and national practices regarding implementation of commitments in the field of market economy and economic co-operation. The continuing validity of the Bonn Document of 1990 was recognized.

It was stressed that successful transition to effective market economy and the achievement of economic prosperity were closely linked to the development and consolidation of democratic political systems and had direct relevance to security and stability. Focusing on the pace and complexity of the transition process, delegations noted that it had developed unevenly and the structural reforms had not been implemented everywhere with the same measure of courage and consistency. While in some cases early and consistent reformers had made important strides ahead, in others serious problems of structural adjustment continued unresolved. Relevant social aspects of the reform process and the need to ensure broad public backing for it were emphasized. The work currently being done by the EU in support of the transition process through bilateral agreements and under PHARE and TACIS programmes was presented. Several delegations called for further political and economic support for the reforms in their countries.

It was noted that, despite considerable progress in many fields, economic disparities and impediments to economic co-operation hindering free movement of goods, services and capital still remained in the OSCE area. The existence of trade and technical barriers, protectionist policies, restrictive customs and travel procedures, and bureaucratic obstacles was criticized. The need for a stable, transparent and predictable legal and institutional framework continued to be essential for a well-functioning market economy, promotion of free trade and foreign investment. It was also stressed that laws and regulations in the economic and environmental field needed to be effectively implemented in order to ensure sustainable economic growth and environmentally sound policies. Successful privatization, the role of the human factor, promotion of small and medium-size enterprises and respect for property rights were also mentioned.

The very high social cost of the reforms in some cases was pointed out, as was the need to address the special problems of States affected by the disruption of traditional economic links as a result of their full compliance with economic sanctions.

Several delegations underscored the inadmissibility of new economic dividing lines in Europe and advocated the creation of a European economic partnership based on common OSCE values. One delegation pointed out that the EU enlargement should not affect negatively the economic relations between new EU members and third countries.

A number of specific areas of co-operation among participating States were examined, in particular industrial co-operation, science and technology, environment, and infrastructure. It was pointed out that these are mainly areas of responsibility of specialized

international organizations. It was nevertheless felt that the OSCE as a political forum could help to assess existing problems.

The continuing existence of a technological and industrial gap between different parts of the OSCE area was recognized and a call was made for technology transfer, assistance in restructuring non-competitive enterprises, and foreign participation in the privatization process. A review of the activities of the EU in this regard was presented. It was pointed out that industrial co-operation was being fostered through industrial round tables, development of industry support services and institutions, training programmes, promotion of concrete projects, and synergies with scientific and technological schemes.

It was noted that adequate and effective protection of intellectual and industrial property as part of a comprehensive legal framework was essential for encouraging foreign direct investment in industry, the establishment of joint ventures, and scientific and technical co-operation. Standardization and certification were also considered essential for industrial co-operation. A project for establishing a "subcontracting system" through the creation of a database of industrial information to encourage commercial contacts between specialized companies was mentioned.

The need to preserve the rich scientific potential of the countries in transition was expressed, and the creation of an international body for co-ordination of scientific, technical and innovation activities in the participating States was suggested. The role of the International Science and Technology Centre in Moscow was highlighted. A proposal was made to convene a second OSCE Scientific Forum, as referred to in Chapter IX paragraph 14 of the Budapest Document 1994.

One delegation, supported by others, pointed at the global magnitude and complexity of present and future environmental risks. The close link between environmental degradation and security at regional and global level and the need for new approaches were particularly stressed. One delegation specifically referred to the aftermath of the Chernobyl disaster. The idea was expressed that the OSCE may facilitate co-ordination of efforts between specialized agencies in the implementation of environmental protection projects. The need to effectively implement the decisions of the Sofia 1995 Ministerial Conference on Environment was highlighted. The work of the European Environment Agency was described as a framework to provide reliable and objective information on the situation in different regions and in Europe as a whole. The fact that EEA was open to States not members of the EU was welcomed, as were the good prospects for interaction with the OSCE. Reference to the activity of the Regional Environmental Centre in Budapest and its interaction with OSCE was also made.

It was recognized that underdeveloped transport, telecommunications and energy infrastructures in various parts of Central and Eastern Europe persisted as obstacles to free trade and investment flows and the integration of countries in transition into world economy. The development and interconnection of trans-European infrastructure networks linking the areas of the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, the Caucasus, the North Sea and the Baltic Sea was considered essential to the progress of economic co-operation. The relevance of the European Energy Charter was underscored.

Special attention was devoted to regional, subregional and transfrontier co-operation as an integral component of the OSCE's comprehensive approach to security and conflict prevention. It was stressed that economic co-operation and trade at subregional and transborder level are a tool to build confidence and promote good-neighbourly relations. At

the same time the need to bridge the gap between different levels of economic development of some neighbouring regions was highlighted.

Various forms of such co-operation developed among the reform countries and/or between them and the EU were presented: interstate co-operation with an organizational structure (existing regional groupings, including CEI, CBSS, BEAC, BSEC and CIS); transfrontier co-operation at the level of regional and local authorities; trade agreements with a regional dimension such as CEFTA and the Baltic Free Trade Agreement. Detailed presentations on the recent activities of CEI, CEFTA, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, CIS and their interaction with the OSCE were delivered. A view was expressed that the OSCE together with other competent bodies should seek to facilitate financing for priority regional projects - e.g. in the field of transport, energy and telecommunications. The importance of a joint CEI-BSEC conference of ministers of transport to be held on 21 and 22 of November 1996 in Sofia was highlighted.

Positive examples of transfrontier and interregional co-operation and the establishment of "Euro-Regions" were welcomed. Information on the relevant activities by the Council of Europe was presented. It was noted, however, that the lack of sufficient funds created the danger of economic asymmetry in some border areas. A suggestion was made that transfrontier co-operation should be properly assessed in the Lisbon Document and further discussed at OSCE seminars.

It was noted that different kinds of regional and subregional groupings and other innovative arrangements could contribute to the creation of common security space and their overlapping membership could help prevent the emergence of dividing lines in the OSCE area. Their helpful role in the process of European integration and in OSCE-wide economic co-operation was underscored. It was also suggested that the OSCE could provide a venue for these groupings to exchange information and experiences.

An exchange of views took place on subregional co-operation initiatives relating to security and stability issues which have been developed in recent years. It was noted that the Pact on Stability in Europe, entrusted to the OSCE as its repository, proved to be an important instrument for the development of good-neighbourly relations. More recently, the successful implementation of the Peace Agreements for Bosnia and Herzegovina inspired various initiatives aimed at long-term stability and co-operation in South-Eastern Europe. Among these are the process of the Balkan Conference on Stability, Security and Co-operation in South-Eastern Europe, initiated by the Bulgarian Government; the EU Royaumont process for Stability and Good Neighbourliness in South-Eastern Europe, and the US South East European Co-operation Initiative (SECI). A view was expressed that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) should not be excluded from regional co-operation and that the OSCE should facilitate the integration of the successor States to former Yugoslavia in European democratic and economic structures.

With regard to SECI it was noted that, in co-operation with other initiatives, it should encourage improvements in the critical transition economies of South-Eastern Europe through information sharing, planning of multi-state programmes and co-ordinated efforts designed to attract private investment. Reference was also made to the ideas and proposals for comprehensive multilateral co-operation contained in the Sofia Declaration of the Conference of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries of South-Eastern Europe held in July 1996. It was suggested that the OSCE could lend political support to the subregional initiatives already mentioned. Similar proposals for subregional co-operation in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia were mentioned.

One delegation stressed the need to implement OSCE economic dimension commitments regarding enhanced co-operation with the Mediterranean region.

Close attention was given to the evaluation of OSCE interaction and co-operation with relevant international economic and financial organizations and institutions. The participation in the sessions of a number of such organizations, which already had a significant record of co-operation with the OSCE - UN/ECE, OECD, UNDP, UNIDO, the World Bank and the Council of Europe - was welcomed by the participating States. Among those not present, the IMF, EBRD, EIB, WTO and ILO were mentioned as potential partners of the OSCE. Delegations assessed the implementation of the relevant provisions of the Budapest Document on closer interaction, enhancement of dialogue, exchange of information and reduction of duplication and overlap. It was acknowledged that each of the above-mentioned institutions offered special expertise, which in combination with other synergetic efforts, represents a vast potential for conflict prevention action. One group of delegations expressed the view that the OSCE should continue to streamline its comparative advantages with respect to specialized organizations, focusing in particular on its comprehensive approach to security. Yet the OSCE's task of providing a comprehensive political framework to stimulate and channel concrete economic activities of others was often seen in a different manner by delegations: while some believe that the contact-point function of the OSCE has been performed satisfactorily, others argue that many opportunities to jointly address sources of economic insecurity have been missed because of lack of co-ordination.

Several proposals were put forward for more structured co-operation with specialized international organizations and for regular consultations and exchange of information with them. It was suggested that the OSCE could invite expert missions of international organizations such as the UN/ECE regional advisors and others from international financial institutions in order to obtain additional information. The idea of developing an overall "economic dimension action plan" was put forward. It was also suggested that documents for co-operation should be signed between the OSCE and the specialized organizations, including those operating in the social sphere, in order to make effective use of each other's expertise and problem-solving capacity.

The decision taken at the Fifty-First Session of the UN/ECE to develop further co-operation with the OSCE was welcomed. The active participation of experts from the ECE and the OECD in recent economic dimension seminars was highlighted. The ECE Conference on transport and the environment to be held in Vienna in November 1997 was mentioned with a view to possible OSCE participation. The representative of the ECE offered to explore various imaginative ideas for joint OSCE-ECE seminars, including the possibility of involving influential commercial law firms in such activities. One delegation announced that in the context of ECE-OSCE co-operation a draft paper on a "system of early warning indicators for crises threatening peace and stability" had been introduced in the ECE.

Common interests were identified for collaboration of the OSCE with UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank, and further development of interaction between the OSCE and the OECD was particularly advocated especially with a view to providing assistance in the transition process.

All present specialized international organizations and institutions described their current priorities as being very closely linked with the OSCE economic dimension concept and expressed readiness to strengthen mutually beneficial co-operation at different levels.

They also expressed interest in participating in OSCE economic dimension seminars suggested for 1997.

The question how to integrate the economic dimension more closely in the mainstream of the OSCE activities relating to conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, and the ways to address economic aspects of security attracted a great deal of attention. An extensive and lively debate took place on these issues, considered by many delegations to be at the heart of the implementation review.

It was stressed that the OSCE is and will remain a forum for unique political action and that as such it should constantly integrate the economic and environmental aspects into its broad and comprehensive concept of security. Delegations recognized that all dimensions of security have equal importance. It was stressed that the OSCE should identify the risks arising out of economic and social problems, discuss their causes and potential consequences, and draw the attention of governments and international organizations to possible appropriate measures. There was a widely shared opinion that economic dimension issues should be more regularly present on the OSCE security agenda. The economic aspects of security were considered to be an integral element of the discussion on a security model.

It was pointed out that domestic instabilities caused by economic crisis can be a serious threat to security. In this connection one delegation stated that economic security and social stability cannot be achieved only through macroeconomic policies, but also require ethical attitudes and solidarity among participating States. The need for a whole range of activities identified as economic confidence-building measures and for adequate social security systems was emphasized. European integration was recognized as a successful security-building factor and a key element of the present security architecture. Several delegations expressed their belief that the accession of new countries to the EU would widen the zone of stability in Europe.

The idea of elaborating a system of early-warning economic and social indicators seemed to attract considerable interest. Though it was noted that the OSCE does not possess any mechanism to prevent or even influence an emerging economic or ecological crisis, some delegations found that the elaboration of the system could still be helpful. Others felt that such a system would be extremely difficult to develop and would require data, expertise and technical capabilities that are not within the reach of the OSCE. One delegation suggested that instead, the OSCE could compile a "catalogue" of criteria reflecting the link between economic and financial factors, on the one hand, and security on the other, taking into account the already available experiences of the competent organizations.

There was also a broad understanding on the need to further strengthen the economic dimension of OSCE action as a way of responding to arising new non-military threats to security and stability. The proposals to strengthen in various ways the economic component of the work of OSCE long-term Missions also seemed to receive broad support. Closer interaction with specialized international organizations and involvement with regional groupings and initiatives was advocated. However, opinions diverged on whether these tasks require increased institutional support and resources. While a large group of delegations believed that the OSCE Secretariat should be given appropriate organizational and financial reinforcement, though mainly within existing resources, another group thought that no organizational change in the Secretariat - but only more efficient management of existing resources - is needed.

Delegations, supporting the idea of the Secretariat's reinforcement, argued that only a very small share of the OSCE resources is assigned to the economic dimension. They suggested that a compact economic division or a position of an Economic Dimension Co-ordinator, assisted by an Economic Dimension liaison officer, should be established. They also proposed to deepen OSCE ties to mutually reinforcing international and financial institutions, to strengthen the economic component of the OSCE Missions as an essential early warning tool, to broaden OSCE interaction with the private sector, business associations and NGO's and to enhance interaction with regional, subregional and transborder co-operative initiatives. A paper along these lines was introduced by two delegations and supported by others. It was agreed to continue the discussion on these issues in an appropriate framework. Two delegations reiterated their previous proposal to establish the post of a High Commissioner for Economic and Ecological issues.

It was stressed that the Economic Forum should continue to be the main OSCE body in the field and should have the double task of implementation review and of discussing a relevant theme. A proposal was made to extend the duration of the EF meetings by one day in order to provide time for the review.

The theme "Market Economy and the Rule of Law" proposed for the Fifth Economic Forum in 1997 in Prague, in view of its significance was widely supported by many Delegations. It was stressed that timely preparation of the meeting is necessary.

OSCE economic dimension seminars were generally assessed in a positive light. References were made to the useful work done at various recent seminars and the need to ensure continuity and follow-up action was stressed. It was noted that topics for the seminars should be selected carefully and well in advance as to reflect real needs and allow better preparation. A view was expressed that in the organization of seminars more use should be made of the logistical capacity of international organizations such as the UN/ECE. As to the financing of seminars, while one group of delegations suggested at least partial coverage from the OSCE budget, another group maintained that those should be financed on a voluntary basis by participating States, in accordance with the established practice.

Delegations took note of the seminars, foreseen by the Secretariat for 1997. There appeared to be general acceptance of the topics and timetable. In addition proposals were made for an OSCE Conference on Post Conflict Economic Rehabilitation to be held in Moscow in early April 1997 and for a seminar on the status and prospects of the pan-European economic co-operation.

The active participation of representatives of the private sector and NGO's in the sessions was highly appreciated. Various ideas put forward by them were seized with interest by delegations. An NGO representing the private sector called for more attention to the economic dimension and was sometimes critical of positions adopted by a group of delegations. A proposal was made to establish an economic dimension office in Berlin and to convene a conference in 1997 on the development of the Russian energy sector. Another NGO representative supported the proposal made at the Fifth Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly for the elaboration of an OSCE Economic Charter. The experience of sending voluntary missions of businessmen to help countries in transition was presented by another NGO. Information was also given about the roundtable of 59 business persons from 20 countries recently held in Vienna. The forum decided to establish in the near future a European Business Council whose activity would be supportive of OSCE's economic dimension.

(c) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the human dimension

Report of Working Group 1(c) Rapporteur Mr. Keith Morrill

- A number of delegations referred to the legal structures through which states regulated religious issues, and pointed out what they regarded as inadequacies, especially when dealing with non-traditional religions. In addition to concerns relating to legislation favouring "traditional" religions, and to the use of registration rules to restrict the freedom of religion, one delegation noted that some States, through anti-proselytization laws, restricted general freedom of speech when applied to religious speech, and called for a discussion on the desirability of laws relating to blasphemy and religious hate speech. A delegation whose country had constitutional rules against proselytization responded that such rules do not restrict an individual's freedom of belief. Another stressed the necessity to respond to "totalitarian" sects and extremist groups. An NGO complained of what it regarded as the interference of State authorities in choosing leaders of officially recognized religious groups.

Many delegations and NGOs welcomed the ODIHR Seminar on Legal Aspects of Religion in 1996 and expressed a desire for some form of follow-up. One suggestion was that ODIHR produce a comparative overview of legal structures dealing with religion in the OSCE area. Another was the establishment of ad hoc working groups on the subject.

- A number of delegations expressed regret that restrictions on freedom of association and assembly were increasing in several participating States. These restrictions included refusal to register NGOs, limiting the activities of trade unions, and the violent reaction of authorities to peaceful political demonstrations. One group of States stressed the importance of freedom of association, as it ensured that elections would not result in "elected dictatorships."

- Several speakers stressed the importance of armed forces respecting the terms of international humanitarian law, as well as the Code of Conduct. Situations in particular participating States where this was not the case were noted. The issue of prevention of torture was discussed under this heading, with delegations and NGOs identifying specific cases in participating States. Some delegations criticized in this regard noted that when torture took place, it was a criminal act, not a state policy, and that perpetrators were investigated and prosecuted. One delegation called for ratification of existing conventions relating to prevention of torture.

Many delegations mentioned efforts to achieve an agreement on a total ban on the production and use of anti-personnel land mines, and suggested that the Summit give a political impetus to the achievement of such an agreement. The need for a moratorium on the export of such mines was also stressed by a group of States.

Several delegations, as well as international organizations and NGOs, stressed the importance of States signing and ratifying existing international humanitarian law instruments.

The programme of joint regional seminars between ODIHR and ICRC was supported. A number of delegations noted positively the work on the development of minimum humanitarian standards in the United Nations system, and the impetus given to this work by

the OSCE seminar on the subject in 1996. Some suggested that the Summit could continue to support the work on this subject in the United Nations.

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly made a brief presentation on its draft OSCE "Code of Conduct on politico-democratic aspects of co-operation". Two delegations expressed interest in this draft, and suggested that it might be discussed in the context of the Summit preparations.

- A number of delegations and NGOs criticized the limitations on freedom of expression and of media in some participating States. It was alleged that in some countries there was heavy-handed censorship and no independent media, and that in other countries governments implemented legislation in such a way as to restrict the independence of media. One delegation stressed its particular concern over the use of "criminal libel" laws relating to the defamation of the state or high officials to restrict the independence of the media. The problem of harassment and attacks on journalists and independent media was also raised, and specific cases referred to.

Many of the delegations so criticized responded, outlining their constitutional and legislative structures guaranteeing media freedom. Countries with specific cases of alleged harassment of journalists stressed that such cases were isolated and were being dealt with according to the law. A number of delegations and NGOs noted that the problem was not one of adequate legislation, but of implementation.

A number of delegations referred to a balance that must be struck between freedom of expression and the acceptable restrictions on that right, such as laws relating to defamation, hate speech, or encouragement of violence. Many delegations supported the need for laws relating to hate speech, although most delegations stressed that such restrictions should be very tightly limited. One delegation advised against such restrictions on freedom of expression. In this context, it was noted that the restrictions on freedom of expression permitted in Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights must be viewed in the context of the relevant case law, which strictly limits their use.

One delegation proposed that the OSCE establish a specialist on media affairs, and proposed that the Summit could support the creation of such a position, and that the Council of Ministers could be assigned to decide on a mandate. A number of delegations expressed an interest in further discussion of this idea, although many stressed the need to avoid duplication. One NGO spoke against the proposal.

Several delegations noted the special importance of a free media for truly democratic elections. In this context the special role of the OSCE in supporting free media in Bosnia and Herzegovina was stressed.

- A number of delegations stressed the importance of cultural and educational exchanges, and the crucial importance of the enjoyment of cultural rights by persons belonging to national minorities. Co-operation with organizations active in the field of culture and education, such as the Council of Europe, was stressed. Several NGOs criticized government restrictions on the cultural and educational opportunities of persons belonging to national minorities in certain participating States.

A number of delegations regretted increased and complex requirements for visas for travel to certain countries. Even when visas were issued, they noted citizens of certain countries - even diplomats - met with suspicion, rudeness, and hostility from border guards

and immigration authorities. Though controls were legitimate, the way in which controls were implemented showed discrimination and a lack of tolerance, in the view of some delegations.

One delegation made a presentation of certain measures and efforts made by its government for the integration of long-term residents in cultural, social, and economic spheres. Another delegation noted that non-citizen residents in other participating States were excluded from political life, and suggested that the solution was the extension of access to citizenship, including acceptance of the concept of dual nationality. In response to this, a delegate noted that there was no consideration being given in his country to acceptance of dual nationality.

- It was noted that freedom of movement was not an absolute right, and that States had the right to protect their frontiers. A number of delegations and NGOs stressed the commitments that have been made to grant asylum to refugees, and the connection between the violation of OSCE commitments and forced migration, as exemplified by the crises in former Yugoslavia. NGOs criticized what they regarded as restrictive approaches to refugee determination. A group of States called on the Lisbon Summit to reconfirm the OSCE commitment to refrain from action which would result in forced modification of the composition of their populations, such as expulsion or ethnic cleansing. Countries of origin were also called on to facilitate the return and reintegration of refugees and displaced persons. One delegation reported on the abolition of the communist era legislation relating to official residence permits as an example of the improvement of freedom of movement in that country.

A number of delegations commended the involvement of the OSCE through ODIHR in the recent Regional Conference to address the problems of refugees, displaced persons, other forms of involuntary displacement and returnees in the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States and relevant neighbouring States. Some delegations expressed the view that this was an example of the appropriate role of the OSCE on this issue: lending political impetus to the work of specialized organizations. One delegation expressed concern that there had been little follow-up to the Conference, noted that it was important for the OSCE to play a role in supporting the "Programme of Action" produced by the Conference, and offered to support financially the creation of a migration expert position in the Secretariat in Vienna with this aim. This proposal was welcomed by another delegation. One delegation also called for a co-ordinated international effort involving the OSCE to deal with the problems of Bosnian refugees, commencing with an international conference on the issue.

- Many delegations stressed the importance of tolerance, not only as an issue of human rights, but also as a matter of conflict prevention. Intolerance existed in all countries. A group of States noted that the problems of intolerance were not only those specified in the work programme, but also arose from discrimination on other grounds, such as gender or sexual orientation. Delegations and a large number of NGOs mentioned specific situations in participating States which they viewed as breaching OSCE commitments to tolerance and non-discrimination, while other delegations raised their own problems and the programmes put in place to address these.

Although it was stressed that the key element in promoting tolerance was education and the long-term changing of people's attitudes, many speakers noted the need for appropriate legal structures to combat discrimination as well. Co-operation between the OSCE and intergovernmental organizations such as the Council of Europe, and also with NGOs, was stressed by some delegations.

- One delegation stressed its concern over growing racist and xenophobic tendencies in the OSCE area, and the resulting incidents of violence. Another expressed the view that to attempt to control racist or hate speech was ineffective and wrong, and that the focus of efforts should be on the investigation and prosecution of ethnic or racist violence.

- A number of delegations stressed the need to grant equal opportunity to migrant workers who are legally in their country of residence. The importance of combating illegal immigration was also stressed. Some delegations underlined the disadvantaged position of migrant workers in their countries of residence, and the fact that they were subject to racist attacks. One delegation suggested that the OSCE elaborate commitments on migrant workers, and that they be recognized as a new form of minority.

- The work of the ODIHR Contact Point for Roma and Sinti was praised by many delegations and NGOs and support was expressed for its further development. A group of States proposed regular internship programmes for Roma in the ODIHR, and the expansion of legal assistance efforts at the Contact Point. It was noted that the situation of Roma, as a minority distributed throughout the OSCE area, and without a national state, was unique. The delegations and NGOs gave numerous examples of intolerance against Roma in all parts of the OSCE area. In response, delegations outlined the policies and structures in place to respond to such problems. Both delegations and NGOs stressed the need for co-operation between the ODIHR and the Council of Europe in this field. One NGO suggested that work on a European Charter on Roma would be desirable.

- The discussion on national minorities was one of the liveliest in the working group. Delegations and NGOs gave numerous examples of what were, in their opinion, infringements on the rights of persons belonging to national minorities. In this regard, it was clear that the key question of the definition of "national minority" remains a vexed issue: some delegations responded to criticisms by noting that the groups in question were not national minorities. Several delegations expressed the opinion that the existence of national minorities was an issue of fact, not law, and called on States to grant legal recognition of their existence. Others noted that in the OSCE the existence of ethnic differences did not necessarily give rise to national minority status. Even where national minorities exist, the name used for the minority, and administrative structures provided by the state, were the subject of criticism by NGOs. One delegation proposed an OSCE comparative study on the treatment of national minorities in the Balkans region. The problem of the abuse of human rights in unrecognized territorial entities, and by non-State entities and groups, was also raised.

The work of the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) was praised, and one delegation stressed the need for continued political support by the participating States for the efforts of the HCNM and of the OSCE missions. One delegation suggested that the HCNM might be invited by States involved in conflicts to offer assistance. The basic treaties between Hungary and Slovakia, and between Hungary and Romania, were welcomed by a number of delegations. It was noted that they provided for a structure for the addressing of bilateral concerns, including those relating to national minorities.

- The issues of self-determination of peoples and of separatism were raised. Two delegations expressed the view that in the OSCE area the right to self-determination must be fulfilled only within the context of the territorial integrity of States. One called on the OSCE to condemn attempts to create new States, and for the participating States not to tolerate the activities of separatist movements. Another delegation took the view that separatism could

be a legitimate expression of the right to self-determination, and that if not permitted to express itself democratically could be forced to turn to violence.

- Many delegations stressed the importance of the independence of the judiciary and the right to a fair trial. Delegations and NGOs identified particular countries and cases in participating States where, in their view, there were concerns about breaches of OSCE commitments in this area. A number of delegations responded to these criticisms with specific information supporting the view that the right to a fair trial existed in their countries. The work of ODIHR in providing training to judges and officials in the rule of law was acknowledged. One delegation spoke of the threat of terrorism to security, democracy and human rights in the OSCE area, and called for greater co-operation within the OSCE on this issue.

- One delegation noted the special challenges facing States which are newly independent, or whose independence is newly re-established, in deciding who will and will not be a citizen. A number of specific situations involving problems relating to citizenship were raised by delegations and NGOs. The issue of citizenship was linked by certain delegations to the issue of the treatment and integration of non-citizens. The setting by one state of a 15-year residency requirement before individuals could qualify for citizenship was pointed to as excessive by a number of delegations. Constitutional provisions stressing the ethnic nature of citizenship were criticized. Accession to the United Nations Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness was encouraged by a group of States.

On the issue of elections, delegations noted the excellent work of ODIHR in election monitoring. Several delegations supported a proposal calling on States to respond formally and in detail to an ODIHR elections report within a specified period. A number of delegations stressed that ODIHR election monitoring must take place in the manner decided by ODIHR, without interference by the State whose elections are being observed. The central role of elections monitoring in ODIHR's mandate was stressed by several delegations. Some called for increased co-operation and co-ordination between the various organizations involved in such effort to achieve a common approach and avoid duplication. A number of NGOs criticized the lack of access of new political parties to the ballot in several participating States with long traditions of democracy: they characterized these barriers as contrary to the OSCE Copenhagen commitments, and called for action by OSCE participating States and institutions. One delegation so criticized noted that such problems could be remedied through existing appeal and regulatory structures, and did not represent a breach of Copenhagen commitments.

- One delegation stressed the importance of civic education, both formal and informal, in building civil society, and outlined the efforts of an exchange programme of civic educators from various participating States. The possibility of areas of co-operation between the OSCE and such an exchange programme was highlighted.

- Many delegations called for the abolition of capital punishment, and criticized those States where capital punishment was still in use. The deterrent effect of capital punishment was questioned. A group of States called on countries that had recently joined the Council of Europe to live up to their commitment to declare a moratorium on capital punishment. Several delegations responded by noting the movement that had taken place in their countries towards the abolition of capital punishment. A number of delegations complained that there was no real exchange of information on the abolition of capital punishment, as required by Paragraph 17 of the Copenhagen Document, and encouraged such an exchange. A seminar on the subject of capital punishment was suggested, as was a role for ODIHR as a clearing

house for information on death sentences and executions. One delegation stressed that the use of capital punishment was supported by the majority of its population. The same delegation noted that this punishment was permitted under international law, provided that due process was respected, which was the case in his country.

- The important role of NGOs in the OSCE was stressed by all delegations. The importance of NGOs in raising public awareness and affecting public policy was noted. Many delegations also stressed the contribution that NGOs could make directly to the work of the OSCE, especially that relating to the Human Dimension, through providing information and expertise. One delegation called for a responsible and objective attitude on the part of NGOs, and encouraged work by NGOs on combating racism and intolerance.

One delegation suggested more extensive and concrete co-operation between the OSCE Bosnia Mission and international and local NGOs, in the preparation of the Bosnian municipal elections. The same delegation suggested that a roster of NGOs capable of supporting democratic development projects generally be developed. Other delegations and NGOs suggested that NGOs could play a role in conflict prevention and OSCE Missions. One delegation, however, made it clear that it believed that joint OSCE-NGO activities were not advisable, as they would compromise the independent nature of NGOs and discriminate between them.

The proposals made in the Secretary General's study on the enhancement of NGO participation in the OSCE were supported by a number of delegations. In the view of some delegations the vital role of NGOs underlined the importance of fulfilling OSCE commitments to develop their activities freely. In this regard one delegation stressed the need to protect human rights defenders, and encouraged OSCE States to actively take part in work on a United Nations declaration on this subject.

- In the discussion on ODIHR, there was agreement that the work of ODIHR was very valuable, and recognition that ODIHR must deal with a broad mandate with limited resources. A number of delegations called for strengthening ODIHR with increased resources, and for an attempt to set priorities among its tasks, or to develop a work programme. The importance of ODIHR's Rule of Law programme was highlighted by a number of delegations, as was ODIHR's election work and its support of the Contact Point on Roma and Sinti. One delegation described ODIHR as the OSCE's Action Office for Human Dimension issues, while another characterized it as an advisory body to the Permanent Council. One delegation objected to the idea of a more independent ODIHR, and expressed the view that attempts to change its mandate or status would lead to its politicization, which was undesirable.

- On the subject of the programme for co-ordinated support, one delegation expressed the view that more resources should be attributed to OSCE work in Central Asia, including strengthening the OSCE Liaison Office in Tashkent. A number of proposals were made for Human Dimension seminars. A large number of delegations supported or co-sponsored the proposal for a seminar on the subject of "The Role of Women in Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management". Proposals were also made for seminars on "Election Administration and Observation" and on "Ethnic Minorities", which would be co-ordinated with the HCNM. The latter idea was supported by several delegations.

III. REVIEW OF THE OSCE ACTIVITIES, INSTITUTIONS, STRUCTURES AND INSTRUMENTS, INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE THE ROLE OF THE OSCE AND FURTHER STRENGTHEN ITS CAPABILITIES

Report of Working Group 2 Rapporteur Mr. Sture Theolin

1. OSCE's operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The Organization's operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina were regarded as particularly significant as a continuing test of the OSCE's capacity to support co-operative security processes within its area.

The Organization's positive and unequivocal contribution to the implementation of the General Framework Agreement was acknowledged. The Chairman-in-Office and the Swiss Government, the Secretary General and his staff as well as all Bosnia Mission personnel had contributed greatly to the achievements. The outstanding contribution of the Head of Mission, Ambassador Robert Frowick, was acknowledged.

In evaluating the OSCE's performance, attention was paid to lessons learnt from the Organization's largest, most complex and most costly operation to date. Initial administrative and logistical problems were to be expected during the establishment of the Mission. Now administrative, organizational and financial streamlining was urgently needed in order to improve the operation.

Participating States stressed that the Mission's mandate and resources needed to be considered if the OSCE was to make a valuable contribution to the consolidation of peace and the re-establishment of a civil society built on democracy, inter-ethnic conciliation and the rule of law. All parties to the General Framework Agreement were urgently reminded of their prime responsibility in this regard. The importance of economic reconstruction for reintegration and reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and revitalized international co-operation for this purpose was emphasized.

Participating States called for better co-ordination between the Mission and the Chairman-in-Office and with the Secretariat and delegations in Vienna, and for more coherent management of the Mission. Many aspects of planning, selection, preparation and training of Mission personnel and co-ordination were seen to be in need of urgent and continuing attention.

Furthermore, participating States expressed their appreciation for the co-operation and mutual support among international organizations and institutions on the ground. In this context, it was stressed that the OSCE needed to closely co-ordinate its activities with the principal international institutions involved, in particular with the High Representative, IFOR and ECMM. Co-ordination and co-operation with the Council of Europe remained essential.

Within the two-year civilian consolidation plan for Bosnia and Herzegovina, participating States recognized that the OSCE would contribute actively in accordance with the guiding principles agreed by the Peace Implementation Council on 14 November 1996. The Organization's priorities were summarized as supervision and monitoring of municipal elections, democratic consolidation and monitoring of human rights, including continued

support to the Ombudsman institution throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as fostering and strengthening independent media and contributing to military-political stabilization of the region. Rectification of acknowledged shortcomings in relation to elections was regarded as necessary in order to ensure that the municipal elections in 1997 would meet higher standards than the September elections.

Concerning CSBMs and arms control, it was expected that the OSCE would continue to engage all parties in genuine and effective implementation of agreements reached so far and would provide strong political impetus to long-term military-political stabilization through regional negotiations, under its auspices, in and around the former Yugoslavia.

The Secretary General, under the guidance of the Chairman-in-Office, was asked to submit, without further delay, comprehensive information and developed proposals for a two-year operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including organizational, financial and personnel aspects.

Participating States confirmed their continued strong commitment to supporting to the OSCE Mission through an early agreement on a realistic budget for 1997 and through secondment of qualified personnel on the basis of urgently needed job descriptions, preferably for longer periods.

2. Pact on Stability, Stability and Good neighbourliness in South-East Europe, regional and sub-regional co-operation

Participating States reviewed the development of the Pact on Stability and reaffirmed its importance for fostering stability and good-neighbourly relations at regional level and in the OSCE area as a whole. The Pact was also regarded as a useful addition to the Organization's conflict-prevention capacities and as a practical example of interlocking institutions. Several thorough presentations of efforts to promote good-neighbourly relations were received with interest. Concerning OSCE follow-up, participating States were encouraged to continue to use the Pact as a repository for their subregional agreements and treaties. There was thought to be a need to specify the particular advantages of the Pact on Stability by comparison with other regional and subregional arrangements. Further development of the European Union's accompanying measures were important in this context.

The prospect of integration with European institutions was regarded by the directly concerned participating States as an invaluable impetus for regional co-operation.

A Troika report on the OSCE follow-up to the Stability Pact was presented. While recognizing the importance and usefulness of the Pact's Round Tables, the most directly concerned participating States suggested that agenda items and other modalities as well as possible wider participation should be further examined in order to make the Tables more useful and result-oriented.

In this context, initiatives for South Eastern Europe were brought forward. The Royaumont process was expected eventually to lead to the establishment of a regional Round Table. Furthermore, it was suggested that the Organization might explore ways of supporting the Southeast European Co-operative Initiative (SECI). The process of co-operation for lasting stability, security and good-neighbourliness in the Balkans launched by the Sofia Conference was also regarded as an important initiative with potential for improving stability

and promoting co-operation in economic and other fields as well as enhancing the region's integration into European structures.

Participating States were of the opinion that subregional initiatives promoted good neighbourly relations and that a more extensive exchange of information should be encouraged between regional and subregional groupings.

3. Mediterranean issues, partners for co-operation

Co-operation with the Mediterranean partners for co-operation was comprehensively reviewed. The high-level meetings, the informal open-ended Contact Group and the subregional seminars had indeed facilitated intensified dialogue with the Mediterranean partners for co-operation on the challenges and risks to security in a Mediterranean perspective - *inter alia* as a contribution to the Security Model exercise - and had promoted mutual understanding of threats to security in the Mediterranean region.

The Mediterranean partners for co-operation expressed their appreciation of the co-operation with the Organization and their adherence to OSCE norms and principles and proposed that this co-operation be enhanced. The political and substantial contributions to OSCE activities made by Mediterranean partners for co-operation, Japan and the Republic of Korea - for example to the activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina - were highly appreciated by participating States.

Partnership status

The five Mediterranean partners for co-operation suggested that they should be invited to attend OSCE meetings that consider specific topics of expanded consultation and co-operation, that the Informal Open-ended Contact Group should be formalized, and that high-level consultations with the OSCE Troika should be held on a regular basis.

It was further suggested that the Mediterranean partners for co-operation, while not participating in OSCE decision-making, should be invited to make proposals on security and co-operation. The Mediterranean partners for co-operation were furthermore encouraged to host OSCE seminars and to co-operate with the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and other OSCE institutions, including the Conflict Prevention Centre.

These proposals were received with interest but need further consideration.

The Republic of Korea proposed that it should be invited to attend OSCE meetings that considered specific topics of expanded consultation and co-operation, and to make contributions without participating in the preparation and adoption of decisions.

4. OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

In view of the fact that democratic power is vested in national Parliaments, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, notwithstanding its use of majority voting practices, can provide forward-looking political impetus to the work of the OSCE policy-making bodies. Participating States welcomed the fact that the Chairman-in-Office and the Troika would be regularly exchanging views and information with the Parliamentary Assembly and its Standing Committee, and would keep the Permanent Council and other OSCE bodies informed about these contacts. It was also proposed that the Parliamentary Assembly could invite a representative of the Troika to meetings of its subcommittees. The

Chairman-in-Office should encourage the Parliamentary Assembly to express views on items on the agenda of the Summit and of the Ministerial and Permanent Councils. It was also noted that the Parliamentary Assembly itself was developing its relations with others, especially with parliamentary assemblies of other organizations and bodies, and was increasing contacts and co-operation in election monitoring activities. It was in this context also argued that the present active dialogue and co-operation with the Parliamentary Assembly was satisfactory and that it would be difficult to further develop relations with the Assembly.

5. Role of Non-Governmental Organizations

Participating States stressed the long-standing and essential role that NGOs play, not least their significant contribution to the strengthening of democracy and human rights in the OSCE region. Although the present modalities were considered adequate on the whole, proposals were made for strengthened OSCE contacts, communication and regular information exchange with NGOs, improved NGO participation at OSCE meetings, and their closer involvement in OSCE activities in such areas as implementation review, election monitoring, conflict prevention, and other areas. The view was also expressed that present modalities for NGO relations were satisfactory.

6. The decision-making process, the role and effectiveness of institutions; the role and effectiveness of OSCE structures

Missions and other OSCE activities on the ground

Participating States, including the Swiss chairmanship, gave positive reviews of the long-term missions (including the Assistance Group in Chechnya), the instrument of Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office and of the HCNM and ODIHR, which together were considered to be prime OSCE instruments for preventive diplomacy.

Many proposals and views were elaborated and may need further study and follow-up.

The role of the Chairman-in-Office in the overall political management of the implementation of each mission's mandate, and that of the Secretary General in providing administrative support and back-up for its activities, were deemed essential.

Flexibility in mission mandates was considered to be invaluable to effective implementation. Nevertheless, some scope was seen for setting out clear objectives to facilitate assessments of the way mandates were being carried out. At the same time, the Chairman-in-Office and the heads of mission could formulate shorter term priorities within the broader mandate.

While no mission could be regarded as permanent, prolongation and termination should be considered on a case-by-case basis. It was proposed that it be accepted practice that a mission's mandate should be routinely extended as a matter of course, preferably for a twelve-month period, by the Permanent Council until the Chairman-in-Office gave a recommendation to the contrary, taking into account the advice of the Head of Mission, and following appropriate and thorough consultations, including with the host government. The question of alternative or "lighter" forms of OSCE presence in a country or region was discussed, *inter alia* in relation to the future of the Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje.

In relation to possible future larger missions, special attention was devoted to lessons learnt from initial substantial, financial and bureaucratic deficiencies and delays in bringing the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina to full capacity. An emergency fund for such purposes was suggested. Several proposals were made in order to increase the efficiency of larger missions, *inter alia*, greater delegation of administrative and financial authority to the mission; increase in capacity of a mission to manage that authority including the possibility of hiring experts; increase in capacity of the Secretariat in Vienna to deal with seconded staffing.

In recognizing the value of the principle of secondment for staffing of missions, preferably for periods of up to one year, attention was drawn to problems of continuity. Participating States were invited to increase the existing pool of their best qualified candidates for members and heads of mission. Improvement in the training of mission personnel was needed along with budgeted resources for this purpose.

The experience of co-operation between missions and ODIHR, ECMM, NGOs and international organizations was seen in a positive light. It was suggested that missions could be strengthened by inclusion, where appropriate, of experts from UN agencies, the Council of Europe, NGOs, etc. Questions concerning some unco-operative attitudes by the parties involved and lack of full support for missions by participating States were also raised.

Missions were invited to concentrate their reporting on developments relevant to their mandate and its fulfilment, and, where in accordance with their mandate, to provide early warning on socio-economic and/or military-political developments relevant to compliance with OSCE commitments.

It was evident from a number of proposals that the Secretariat needed the capacity to react twenty-four hours a day to emergencies in the field.

The annual meetings of Heads of Missions and the involvement of NGOs and international organizations in them were considered useful. The possibility of more frequent or regional meetings was discussed.

Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights

The need to strengthen the link between the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and the political institutions of the OSCE, in particular the Permanent Council and the Chairman-in-Office, as set out in the Budapest Document, was underlined. The current practice of ODIHR providing the Chairman-in-Office with confidential early warning reports was welcomed.

Participating States acknowledged that ODIHR had a very wide mandate, whereas the resources and personnel provided for fulfilling that mandate were insufficient. Priority-setting within the mandate was supported by several participating States, but was seen as problematic by others. The Permanent Council could make better use of the regular visits of the Director of ODIHR to Vienna.

The scarcity of resources was pointed out also in the context of ODIHR's election monitoring activities, and calls were made for improving the personnel situation at the elections unit in Warsaw. Participating States should assist the Office in this field, i.e. by providing sufficient numbers of observers. It was proposed that a roster of observers that participating States are willing to second to ODIHR be established. The Organization's role

in co-ordinating election monitoring should be strengthened through ODIHR, possibly by formulating MoUs with other international institutions.

Participating States had undertaken to notify ODIHR in good time of elections, and no explicit invitation to monitor was deemed necessary. In certain cases, ODIHR monitoring could be supported by a decision by the Chairman-in-Office. It was seen as ODIHR's own prerogative to organize the election monitoring, within the limits of its mandate and resources, and without interference. There was wide support for a proposal that participating States on whose territory elections had been observed would submit a written report on ODIHR's findings and recommendations to the Chairman-in-Office or to the Permanent Council.

ODIHR activities in other fields, such as the rule of law, free media and Roma and Sinti, were appreciated. Suggestions were made on themes for ODIHR seminars for next year, and the usefulness of co-operation with the Council of Europe was pointed out. Seminars with a regional focus were also discussed.

Different views were expressed on the future location of the ODIHR and the human dimension review meetings.

High Commissioner on National Minorities

Participating States voiced continued appreciation and support for the mandate and the successful and effective activities of the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM). Several directly concerned States expressed the importance and appreciation of the High Commissioner's continued interest in their national minorities. No change in the High Commissioner's mandate was deemed necessary.

It was proposed that, at Lisbon, all participating States should reaffirm their full support for the mandate and activities of the HCNM and their willingness to co-operate with him in all his activities within the framework of his mandate. Furthermore, upon the initiative of the HCNM, the Permanent Council could devote more attention to the state of implementation of his recommendations. Potential was also seen for stronger co-operation between OSCE missions and HCNM.

Court of Conciliation and Arbitration

The Court of Conciliation and Arbitration was operational and available to participating States as an instrument to be used when other instruments for peaceful conflict settlement had failed. Attention was drawn to the fact that the Court could also be used by States not yet party to the Stockholm Convention. Thanks to its flexibility, competence and independence, the Court was also seen by some participating States as an additional tool for preventive diplomacy.

Minsk process - preparation of OSCE peacekeeping operations

The Review Meeting underlined the synergism generated through the institutional support offered to the parties of the conflict by the Co-Chairmanship of the Minsk Group, the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office and the assistants in the field, and by the High-Level Planning Group. Participating States expressed regret that progress in the past two years towards a peaceful and sustainable solution of the conflict according to OSCE

principles had been slow and appealed for an acceleration of the process. The continued involvement and support of the OSCE was essential.

Role and effectiveness of institutions

The Review Meeting thought that the OSCE institutions functioned well on the whole.

The Chairman-in-Office was seen as the political focal point of the Organization. His performance and capacity could be strengthened if more tasks were delegated to other Troika members, and if the Secretary General took a more active role as provided for according to his mandate, including support to the Chairman-in-Office. The Secretary General's proposals for administrative streamlining of the Secretariat were supported.

The fundamental importance of decision-making by consensus was underlined. The OSCE's comparative advantage lay in its flexible political approach to conflict prevention and crisis management. Varying views were expressed on the political and legal utility of providing the Organization with a legal personality.

The deliberations of the Permanent Council could be improved by organizing sessions with participation at a higher level.

Many delegations expressed a continued strong commitment to the separate identity of the Forum for Security Co-operation. However, it was proposed that greater synergy should be created between the Permanent Council and the Forum so as to improve information flows and ensure better follow-up to work and political impetus, e.g. by holding joint meetings and developing consultations on subjects of common concern or interest. Ways should also be found to provide for longer periods of chairmanship of the Forum.

Varying views were presented on the suitability of relocation of all OSCE institutions to Vienna.

Within the framework of this discussion, Turkey formally proposed that the next Summit Meeting of Heads of State or Government be held in Istanbul.

Review process

The OSCE conducts separate implementation reviews within the military-political, economic and human dimensions. Such meetings were deemed useful and should be held annually with more concentrated and dynamic agendas.

The location of review meetings and Summit preparatory meetings in Vienna should be considered.

Other organizational proposals

It was proposed that a group of experts be established to review OSCE co-operation in combating *terrorism*. Although the risks and challenges presented by terrorism were widely recognized, there was no consensus on the proposal.

Concerning *non-implementation*, there was some discussion of possible improvements in the OSCE's abilities to respond to and remedy in a co-operative manner

cases of non-compliance by participating States with OSCE norms, principles or commitments.

Proposals for *new posts in the Secretariat*, including the creation of posts for an Economic Dimension co-ordinator and a migration expert were mentioned.

7. Administrative, financial and other technical aspects of the Organization

The elaboration and approval in 1996 of the OSCE Financial Regulations were welcomed as a means of adjusting the resource management to the requirements of an Organization whose resources in the last years had multiplied several times owing to the demands put on it by participating States, and now in practical terms exceeded ATS 1000 million. In spite of this expansion, administrative resources had been stretched to the limit in 1996. The creation of a Revolving Fund for meeting short term cash flow requirements was seen as a positive development. Voluntary funding was considered necessary also with a view to starting new OSCE operations as quickly as possible.

To allow funding of major operations that cannot always be foreseen, the creation of a predictable and gradual mechanism, an “Emergency Fund”, was proposed.

Nevertheless, it was noted that, contrary to practices in other national and international bodies, the OSCE appeared to give relatively low priority to budgetary, administrative and financial matters.

It was desirable that the informal Financial Committee focus on administrative and budgetary oversights and that day-to-day operational decisions be left to the Secretary General. The weak status of the informal Financial Committee was regretted and it was proposed that it be transformed into an Administrative and Budgetary Committee composed of financial and administrative experts nominated by participating States. The new Committee could be convened for well-prepared quarterly sessions, with the possibility of ad hoc meetings to respond to new political decision and activities. It should consider the Secretary General’s draft proposals for the regular annual budget and follow developments over the year. Decision-making authority on financial and administrative issues remains with the Permanent Council. As the Committee would be supported by the Secretariat and would not involve interpretation, no additional costs were foreseen.

Another proposal for administrative streamlining and enhancing the efficiency of OSCE institutions and activities, including its missions, was the creation of the post of Inspector-General.

Methods and possible criteria for revision of the scale of assessed contributions adopted in 1992 were discussed. It was the opinion of some participating States that their contributions were disproportionate considering the principle of burden-sharing and their economic and social situation. Given the decision-making practices of the OSCE, any changes regarding the established scale of assessed contributions depended on consensus building, which would probably be both difficult and time-consuming.

8. OSCE’s co-operation with other international organizations and institutions

OSCE co-operation with international organizations was seen to be developing positively and experience gained through co-operation on the ground, joint activities such as seminars and strengthened institutional links were welcomed. Experience gained in Bosnia

and Herzegovina in this regard was seen to be positive. It was generally recognized that potential for developing further co-operation and information exchange existed.

Proposals were put forward on how existing co-operation and co-ordination between the OSCE and the Council of Europe could be further enhanced, taking into account the specific character and comparative advantages of both organizations as well as the need to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Participating States and organizations involved considered that no strict division of labour should be attempted and that some degree of overlap was positive. Inter-institutional co-operation may be accelerated when States members of different organizations co-ordinate their national policies.

The possibility of involving human rights experts or economic experts from other international organizations in OSCE missions on the ground was raised.

Specific reference was made to co-operation in various areas with the United Nations and its specialized agencies, co-operation which could also be developed on a case-by-case basis. A number of representatives of international organizations spoke on ongoing co-operation with the OSCE and pledged their willingness to develop this further. UNHCR referred to co-operation with the OSCE and IOM on the CIS Migration Conference and expressed the hope that the OSCE would commit itself at Lisbon to continued engagement in the post-Conference phase.

Reference was made to the OSCE's status as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter and the possibility of enhancing security-related co-operation was recognized. Support was expressed for the idea that the OSCE should be able to refer a dispute to the UNSC, if necessary even without the consent of the State(s) party to the conflict. However, there was no consensus for this proposal.

In the concluding part of the session, a number of delegations addressed the review process in general and experience gained during this Review Meeting. There was agreement that review of implementation remained an essential characteristic of the OSCE, but differing views were expressed as to how this should be carried out, whether in meetings devoted to review or in the framework of the OSCE's existing structures. The need was seen to improve opportunities for lively discussion and exchange of views.



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council

PC.DEC/137
19 September 1996

Original: ENGLISH

84th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 84, Agenda item 1

DECISION No. 137

AGENDA, ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK, TIMETABLE AND
OTHER MODALITIES OF THE 1996 REVIEW MEETING
AND THE PREPARATORY MEETING TO THE LISBON SUMMIT

I. AGENDA

- A. Review Meeting
1. Formal opening
 2. Statement by the Chairman-in-Office or his representative
 3. Reports by:
 - (a) the Secretary General
 - (b) the High Commissioner on National Minorities
 - (c) the Director of the ODIHR
 - (d) the Chairman of the Forum for Security Co-operation
 4. General debate
 5. Contributions by:
 - (a) Mediterranean partners for co-operation
 - (b) partners for co-operation (Japan, Republic of Korea)
 - (c) the United Nations
 - (d) other international organizations and institutions
 - (e) the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly
 - (f) the President of the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration
 6. Review of implementation, including a focus on recommendations for future action and greater co-operation among participating States:
 - (a) Review of the implementation of all OSCE principles and commitments
 - (b) Review of OSCE activities, institutions, structures and instruments, including consideration of proposals designed to enhance the role of the OSCE and further strengthen its capabilities

7. Reports by the Rapporteurs and Chairman's Summary
8. Formal closure
- B. Preparatory Meeting
 1. Formal opening
 2. Preparation of a document to be adopted at the Meeting of Heads of State or Government of the participating States, to be held in Lisbon on 2 and 3 December 1996
 3. Formal closure

II. ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK, TIMETABLE AND OTHER MODALITIES

1. Agenda items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 of the Review Meeting will be dealt with at plenary meetings. Those making reports or contributions under agenda items 3, 5(c), 5(d), 5(e) and 5(f) are encouraged to do so in writing. Under agenda items 4, 5(a) and 5(b), States may also submit their opening statements in writing. Possible oral presentations under agenda items 3, 4 and 5 should not exceed 5 minutes.

Under agenda item 3, the Chairman of the Joint Consultative Group may provide information on the functioning of the CFE regime. Under agenda item 6, the Chairman of the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Chairman of the Security Model Committee will be invited to report to the plenary on 18 November 1996.

2. The Mediterranean partners for co-operation will be invited to the Review Meeting. They will be invited to make their contributions to the Review Meeting in plenary and in the appropriate sessions of the Working Groups, in the context of the relevant provisions of the Final Act and other OSCE documents, with respect to the realization of the objectives concerning security and co-operation in the Mediterranean as well as co-operation and closer links with the OSCE as set out in these documents.

Japan will be invited to make its contributions in plenary as well as in the appropriate sessions of the Working Groups, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Helsinki Document 1992.

The Republic of Korea will be invited to observe proceedings in the plenary as well as in the appropriate sessions of the Working Groups of the Review Meeting and to make its contribution in plenary.

3. Agenda item 6 of the Review Meeting will be dealt with at plenary meetings and in the Working Groups. The work of the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Security Model Committee, as envisaged in this document, is to be considered an integral part of the review process. An indicative work programme for each Working Group will be decided upon by the first plenary of the Review Meeting after open-ended informal consultations, to be finalized prior to the opening of the Review Meeting. It has been decided, for practical and organizational reasons, to establish the following Working Groups:

WORKING GROUP 1 (23 sessions):

Review of the implementation of all OSCE principles and commitments:

- (a) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the politico-military aspects of security.
(4 sessions)
- (b) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic dimension.
(5 sessions)
- (c) Implementation of OSCE commitments in the human dimension.
(13 sessions)

- (d) Conclusions from the discussions of the Working Group.
(1 session)

WORKING GROUP 2 (10 sessions):

Review of OSCE activities, institutions, structures and instruments, including consideration of proposals designed to enhance the role of the OSCE and further strengthen its capabilities:

- (a) Pact on Stability in Europe.
(1 session)
- (b) Operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (elections, human rights, democratization); lessons to be drawn from this experience and developments required.
(2 sessions)
- (c) OSCE relations with others: Mediterranean issues, partners for co-operation, Parliamentary Assembly, role of NGOs and contacts with them.
(2 sessions)
- (d) Administrative, financial and other technical aspects of the Organization.
(1 session)
- (e) The decision-making process, the role and effectiveness of the institutions; the role and effectiveness of OSCE structures.

Operation of existing mechanisms and instruments and new instruments; the operational role of the OSCE: functioning of Missions and other OSCE activities on the ground; preventive diplomacy and crisis management, preparation of OSCE peacekeeping operations, High Commissioner on National Minorities, Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, Directed Conciliation, ad hoc Conciliation and the Valletta Mechanism.
(3 sessions)

- (f) Co-operation with other international organizations and institutions; Conclusions from the discussions of the Working Group.
(1 session)

4. The plenary of the Review Meeting will provide direction to the Working Groups. The plenary, in closed session, may also give guidance on preparatory work to be undertaken in Vienna on the Summit document.

5. In keeping with the increasing openness of OSCE activities, representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) having relevant experience in the area under discussion are free, on the basis of the procedures set out in Annex 1, to attend and contribute to the sessions of Working Group 1(b) and 1(c), as well as to the session of Working Group 2(b) devoted to implementation.
6. Other subsidiary working bodies of the Review Meeting may be set up by the plenary to deal with specific questions.
7. The plenary meetings of the Review Meeting will be open unless otherwise decided.
8. Agenda items 1 and 3 of the Preparatory Meeting will be dealt with in the Committee of the Whole of the Preparatory Meeting. Agenda item 2 will be dealt with by the Committee of the Whole and drafting groups established for this purpose by the Preparatory Meeting.
9. The plenary meetings, Working Group and other subsidiary group meetings of the Review Meeting and the Preparatory Meeting will be held in accordance with the meeting schedule contained in this document. The meeting schedule will be subject to constant review and possible readjustment by the respective plenary or Committee of the Whole.
10. The representatives of the following international organizations and institutions will be invited to make their contributions to the Review Meeting in plenary: the United Nations, Council of Europe, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Western European Union, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Investment Bank, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, as well as the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Council of the Baltic Sea States, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, the Black Sea Economic Co-operation and the Central European Initiative.

In view of their active involvement in the work of the OSCE in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the International Committee of the Red Cross will also be invited to make their contributions in plenary.

The above international organizations and institutions, as well as any others which may be agreed, may be invited to make contributions to appropriate sessions of the Working Groups of the Review Meeting in the context of relevant items.
11. The rules of procedure and the working methods of the OSCE will be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Review Meeting and the Preparatory Meeting.
12. The Chair at the plenary meetings will be taken by a representative of the Chairman-in-Office. The first meeting of each Working Group will be chaired by a representative of the Chairman-in-Office; thereafter the Chair will be rotated meeting by meeting, in French alphabetical order, starting with the representative of Uzbekistan for Working Group 1 and the representative of Belarus for Working Group 2. The current, previous and future Chairmen, as well as relevant rapporteurs, will hold regular consultations on the proceedings in the Working Group.

The representative of the Chairman-in-Office will, after consultations with the participating States, appoint rapporteurs for the Working Groups. One rapporteur should be designated for each of the issues dealt with in Working Group 1 under (a), (b) and (c) and at least one rapporteur for Working Group 2. Their reports, which will not be considered as binding documents, will be presented in the final plenary meeting.

13. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole will be taken by a representative of Portugal.

14. The Review Meeting will be opened in Vienna on 4 November 1996 at 10 a.m. It will be closed on 22 November 1996.

15. The Preparatory Meeting will be opened in Lisbon on 25 November 1996 at 10 a.m. It will be closed on 29 November 1996.

Meeting Schedule

REVIEW MEETING

Working hours: 10 a.m. - 1 p.m.
3 p.m. - 6 p.m.

Week 1	Monday 04.11.96	Tuesday 05.11.96	Wednesday 06.11.96	Thursday 07.11.96	Friday 08.11.96
Morning	Plenary	DG WG 1(c)	(FSC) WG 1(c)	(PC) WG 1(c)	(SMC) WG 1(c)
Afternoon	Plenary WG 1(c)	(SMC) WG 1(c)	DG WG 1(b)	(FSC) WG 1(b)	Plenary WG 1(c)

Week 2	Monday 11.11.96	Tuesday 12.11.96	Wednesday 13.11.96	Thursday 14.11.96	Friday 15.11.96
Morning	(FSC) WG 1(c)	DG WG 1(c)	(FSC) WG 1(c)	(PC) WG 1(c)	(SMC) WG 1(c)
Afternoon	DG WG 1(b)	(SMC) WG 1(a)	WG 1(b) WG 2(a)	(FSC) WG 1(b)	WG 1(c) WG 2(b)

Week 3	Monday 18.11.96	Tuesday 19.11.96	Wednesday 20.11.96	Thursday 21.11.96	Friday 22.11.96
Morning	Plenary WG 2(b)	DG WG 2(c)	DG WG 2(e)	(PC) WG 2(e)	Plenary
Afternoon	WG 1(a) WG 2(c)	WG 1(a) WG 2(d)	WG 1(a) WG 2(e)	WG 1(d) WG 2 (f)	

WG 1 23 sessions
 WG 2 10 sessions
 DG Slots reserved for informal consultations on the Lisbon Summit Document(s)
 (PC) Slots reserved for Permanent Council meetings
 (SMC) Slots reserved for meetings of the Security Model Committee
 (FSC) Slots reserved for meetings of the Forum for Security Co-operation

LISBON PREPARATORY MEETING

	Monday 25.11.96	Tuesday 26.11.96	Wednesday 27.11.96	Thursday 28.11.96	Friday 29.11.96
Morning	COW	DG	DG	DG	DG
Afternoon	DG	DG	DG	DG	COW

COW Committee of the Whole

Concerning Section II, paragraph 5:

Representatives of NGOs are invited to make written presentations through the OSCE Secretariat on the basis of which they may address specific questions orally as appropriate. Each contribution will not exceed five minutes.

All NGOs wishing to attend the meetings of Working Group 1(b), Working Group 1(c) or the session of Working Group 2(b) devoted to implementation, will be admitted, subject to provisions contained in Chapter IV, paragraph 15 and 16 of the Helsinki Document 1992. Prior to the meetings, the OSCE Secretary General, in consultation with the ODIHR, will distribute to all participating States a list of the NGOs intending to participate. The Secretary General will keep participating States regularly informed of additional NGOs wishing to attend the meetings of the Working Groups. Should questions arise concerning the application of Chapter IV, paragraph 16, of the Helsinki Document 1992, the Secretary General, assisted by the ODIHR, will undertake consultations to ensure that any decision on the matter is in conformity with the provisions of the said paragraph and is based on the views of the interested participating States.