Annexes

Towards a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian Security Community

From Vision to Reality

Table of Contents

Purpose of the Report

In late 2011, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Germany, France, Poland and the Russian Federation asked the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE) at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH), the Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique (FRS), the Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM), and the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University) of the Russian Foreign Ministry (MGIMO) to organize a series of workshops in order to advance the discussion on the future character of a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community and to present a report with recommendations to the participating States of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in Vienna. With their initiative, the Ministers took up the idea of establishing a network of academic institutions, a proposal made by OSCE Secretary General Lamberto Zannier during his inaugural speech to the Permanent Council on 4 July 2011.

The purpose of this report is to contribute to a critical and illuminating debate on the conceptualization of a security community. We are fully aware that, as we present this report, Europe in particular is going through a fundamental economic and political crisis. However, we believe that the very fact of this crisis makes the objective of a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community and the benefits it offers all the more urgent and necessary.

This report builds on four workshops held in Berlin, Warsaw, Paris and Moscow from March through July 2012. The workshops were attended by a total of about 300 participants and guests from 40 countries and four international organizations. The working group established by the four institutes benefitted from additional meetings with officials in each of the four capitals.

The institutes have also greatly profited from co-operation with the Foreign Ministries of the four countries, including their Permanent Delegations to the OSCE, and from the assistance given by the Irish OSCE Chairmanship. Outstanding contributions were made at the workshops and in discussions by Minister Guido Westerwelle, former Ministers Igor Ivanov and Adam Daniel Rotfeld, former OSCE Secretary General Marc Perrin de Brichambaut, Deputy Minister Bogusław Winid, Deputy Minister Alexander Grushko, and former State Secretary Wolfgang Ischinger. The discussions at all workshops were most informal and deeply enriching. The participants and guests at the workshops deserve a special acknowledgement for this. Any shortcomings in this report are the sole responsibility of its authors.

Executive Summary

The vision of a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community, as advanced by the 2010 Astana OSCE Summit meeting, is particularly important against the background of the strategic uncertainty the OSCE area faces now and in the future. The global shift in the balance of economic power, the refocusing of international politics towards the Pacific, the crisis of the Euro zone and the uncertainty regarding the future of the European Union and of Russia make the appeal of this vision less plausible than it was twenty-two years ago when the Charter of Paris for a New Europe was adopted.

Against this background, the emergence of a genuine security community throughout the OSCE area cannot be taken for granted. However, the acknowledgement of the challenges ahead only emphasizes the importance of the vision of a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community offered by the OSCE Heads of State or Government. It reminds us that the OSCE participating States can benefit more from coming closer together via increasing convergence in all areas than they can from drifting further apart.

The strategic uncertainties within the OSCE, manifested in political and institutional divergence among the participating States, have increased over the past decade. All participating States appear to share the expectation that developing a security community should make war among its members impossible, regardless of whether they are members of alliances or not. However, states have different views on what needs to be done to achieve this goal. Whereas some concentrate on the traditional politico-military 'hard security' issues, others emphasize the primary importance of developing a viable community of values.

If developing a security community is conceptualized as a process rather than as a single act, these two approaches need not be seen as mutually exclusive, but can rather be followed in parallel. A security community cannot be successful if the security or normative concerns of individual states are not appropriately addressed. Nor can it be reduced to inter-state relations or 'hard security' issues. A security community can only grow through the active involvement and engagement of the societies at all levels.

Building a security community in the OSCE area cannot be delegated to the OSCE alone. States benefit from the existence of a dense network of European, Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian institutions. Despite problems in specific relations, all OSCE participating States work together in multiple institutional settings, whether as full members or associate partners. Building a security community will thus involve a number of different institutional formats. At the same time, being the single most inclusive organization in this area, with a comprehensive mandate, the OSCE has an important role to play in this process.

Starting from its current agenda, the OSCE participating States can contribute to building a security community in the OSCE area by:

1. Preserving the existing arms control *acquis*, further pursuing conventional arms control and substantially modernizing confidence- and security-building measures.

2. Making concerted efforts to solve protracted conflicts, and, as a matter of urgency, to prevent any increase of tensions.

3. Assessing the effects that the situation in Afghanistan may have on the OSCE area after 2014 and appropriately adjusting relevant activities.

4. Promoting long-term reconciliation processes throughout the OSCE area.

5. Further developing the OSCE transnational threats agenda, concentrating on cyber security, countering terrorism, and combating illicit drug trafficking.

6. Developing its own initiatives for dialogue and promoting the implementation of relevant international instruments in the economic and environmental dimension throughout the OSCE area.

7. Improving the effectiveness of the OSCE's human dimension work by monitoring the compliance of all OSCE participating States in an equal manner and by streamlining the human dimension events cycle.

8. Providing a platform for enhancing understanding between states and Muslim communities and engaging with the new political and societal forces of the Arab Spring.

9. Developing an OSCE network of academic institutions to facilitate open debate and communication on the relevant issues on the OSCE agenda.

10. Making better use of the institutional richness in the OSCE area through more effective co-operation, particularly with the organizations in the Eastern part of the OSCE space.

1. The Vision of a Security Community

At their 2010 Astana Summit meeting, the Heads of State or Government of the 56 OSCE participating States committed themselves

> "to the vision of a free, democratic, common and indivisible Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community stretching from Vancouver to Vladivostok, rooted in agreed principles, shared commitments and common goals."

The Astana Commemorative Declaration further elaborates on the concept of "comprehensive, co-operative, equal and indivisible security, which relates the maintenance of peace to the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and links economic and environmental co-operation with peaceful inter-State relations". It further develops a vision of a security community which "should be aimed at meeting the challenges of the 21st century", is "based on full adherence to common OSCE norms, principles and commitments across all three dimensions", and should "unite all OSCE participating States across the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian region, free of dividing lines, conflicts, spheres of influence and zones with different levels of security".

With this far-reaching vision, the Astana Commemorative Declaration advanced what the Heads of State or Government had endeavoured to achieve twenty years earlier in the 1990 Charter of Paris:

> "The era of confrontation and division in Europe has ended. We declare that henceforth our relations will be founded on respect and co-operation. […] Ours is a time for fulfilling the hopes and expectations our peoples have cherished for decades: steadfast commitment to democracy based on human rights and fundamental freedoms; prosperity through economic liberty and social justice; and equal security for all our countries."

A security community is a bold vision that can only materialize if states and societies actively pursue this goal. However, the majority of political elites and the broader public have not taken any notice of it. Furthermore, individual states often define the concept of a security community in quite different – even contradictory – terms. Whereas some states believe that the way towards a security community must begin by addressing 'hard security' issues, other point out that a genuine security community presupposes the existence of a community of values. Any viable process towards building a security community in the OSCE area will have to reconcile these different approaches.

This report proceeds on the basis of the understanding that a security community stands for a community of states and societies whose values,

social orders and identities converge to such a degree that war among them becomes unthinkable. A security community means stable and lasting peace among states and within societies where there are no longer zones of different security, regardless of whether individual states belong to alliances or not. Disputes are resolved by peaceful means only. The notion of a security community is not limited to relations between states, but includes all sectors and levels of societies that are interconnected by multiple channels of free communication and free movement. It also allows for more effective common responses to shared threats and challenges.

A security community cannot be created by a single founding act, but is rather the result of a long-term process that allows the overcoming of the legacies of the past, the creation of mutual trust, an increase in convergence, and the development of common identities and institutions. A security community is not an alliance directed against any outside state or alliance.

The process towards a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community extends beyond the OSCE. However, as the most comprehensive and inclusive international organization in its region, the OSCE has to play an important role as a 'security community-building institution'.

2.   Arguments in Favour of a Security Community of the OSCE Participating States

While individual OSCE participating States may have different visions of a security community and see different rationales for engaging in security-community building, there is solid common ground for the pursuit of this goal.

Shared Identity of Europeanness

All OSCE participating States share an identity of Europeanness, a common history and culture, which builds on a centuries-old heritage of economic exchange and political and cultural communication.

Safeguarding Common Principles and Values

A Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community would safeguard and consolidate our joint principles and values. Starting with the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, the OSCE participating States committed themselves to a comprehensive *acquis* of shared values and commitments, which they confirmed at the Astana Summit meeting in the context of declaring their support for a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community. This common *acquis,* and the shared OSCE institutions, have brought them together and kept them together even in most difficult periods of the OSCE's history. Although much of the *acquis* remains to be fully implemented, it has continuously contributed to developing and strengthening a sense of a common normative space.

Addressing Transnational Threats and Challenges
In the 21ˢᵗ century, the OSCE participating States share new threats and challenges which are transnational and often global in nature. Some of them, such as global warming, climate change, cyber security, transnational terrorism and drug trafficking challenge the very foundations of states and societies in the OSCE area. Finding appropriate responses to transnational threats has emerged as an important area of convergence among the OSCE participating States.

Utilizing Economic Complementarity for the Challenge of Modernization
In a world that is expected to be home to eight billion people by 2025, and which is increasingly shaped by emerging powers, all OSCE participating States have a great deal to gain by strengthening and expanding economic, technological and scientific co-operation with each other, particularly in view of the high level of interdependence and complementarity of their economies. The conjunction in the OSCE area of a wealth of energy and mineral resources, highly developed knowledge-based industries and services, advanced technological development and the capacity for innovation, as well as accumulated human capital, allows the participating States to jointly meet the mounting challenges of competition and modernization in the globalized world.

Setting Global Standards
With its technological lead, strong institutions and high standards of governance, rule of law and comprehensive transparency, a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community could provide a model for a norm- and rule-based international order.

3.   Developments in the OSCE Space

Building a security community in the OSCE area does not start from scratch. Over the past two decades, the process of increasing convergence within the OSCE area has significantly advanced in many areas, although it has been accompanied by repeated setbacks.

The Threat of a Major War – A Feature of the Past
The greatest achievement of the last two decades is that a major war in Europe between states and alliances – the ever-present threat during the era of East-West confrontation – has become inconceivable. Although differences between states persist, there are no more antagonistic or major ideological divides within the OSCE space. However, the 2008 Georgian-Russian conflict and earlier conflicts have clearly demonstrated that the use of force on a smaller scale is still possible within the OSCE area.

Trends towards Convergence

Almost all OSCE participating States are now market economies, even if their forms vary considerably. The economies within the OSCE space are highly interconnected, and states and societies are aware of this growing interdependence. The ongoing economic and financial crisis has made it evident that the welfare of each society depends on the welfare of all the others.

There has been a remarkable process of normative convergence throughout the OSCE area over the past two decades, even though it has been uneven in terms of implementation. All OSCE participating States have declared their adherence to the same values and norms, including respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy based on political pluralism and the rule of law. In the Astana Commemorative Declaration, they reaffirmed "categorically and irrevocably that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned".

Further convergence is resulting from the membership of an increasing number of states in or their co-operation with other international organizations in the OSCE area. Almost all participating States are members of or observers in the Council of Europe. Most of them have become members in the World Trade Organization. And many states that are not members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or the European Union (EU) have developed partnership relations of varying degrees of intensity with them.

As far as transnational threats are concerned, there is increasing co-operation among a wide range of organizations. The density of bilateral co-operation between businesses and civil society organizations, as well as of cultural and human contacts in general has increased dramatically. All participating States now share a common information space that allows for a freer flow of information across their borders.

Newly Emerging Areas of Divergence

More recently, however, new lines of divergence have formed between the OSCE participating States. They are pursuing contradictory agendas and disagree on an increasing number of issues. The culture of compromise is in decline. The implementation of the agreed norms and commitments is uneven. The predominance of the security dilemma results in zero-sum games and deep mutual mistrust – many states still share the perception that optimizing one's own security is only possible at the price of less security for others. Despite the declared commitment to indivisible and co-operative security, there are different levels of security within the OSCE space. Already achieved levels of co-operative security are being eroded. Many areas, such as energy, natural resources and migration, have been excessively politicized.

416

Recent efforts to turn things around, such as the OSCE's Corfu Process, have failed to produce conclusive results.

Lack of Proper Communication
Existing differences and contradictions are exacerbated by different underlying patterns of understanding and interpretation. The dominant perception in the West is that the lack of democracy and human rights abuses in post-Soviet states lead to non-co-operative foreign policy. From the Eastern perspective, the Western democracy discourse is seen as part of the traditional pursuit of geopolitics and a remnant of Cold War rhetoric and thinking. Discussions are often of a tactical nature. Open dialogue over strategic interests and objectives does not take place. The result is mutual frustration and the recurring confirmation of mutual mistrust.

The Effects of the Financial and Economic Crisis
The overall situation has been further exacerbated by the effects of the current economic and financial crisis. Individual countries and groups of countries tend to turn inwards, are absorbed by addressing their own pressing problems and are less inclined to invest in joint projects, shared institutions and a common future. The crisis has once again highlighted substantial differences in terms of economic output, productivity, the capacity for innovation, employment and welfare as well as of the levels of stateness in the OSCE area. A failure to sincerely address those fundamental challenges and to develop a more sustainable economic model would represent a serious stumbling block for a genuine security community in the OSCE area. On the other hand, working more closely together in identifying appropriate responses to the current crisis would inevitably boost the process of security community-building.

The Crisis of Institutions
Almost all international organizations in the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian space are facing complex challenges. Overcoming the current financial and economic crisis poses an unprecedented challenge to the European Union. The current alternatives are deeper integration or increasing fragmentation. Overcoming the crisis will take time and energy and will have implications for the EU's external engagement.

NATO, for its part, is reassessing its post-Afghanistan role in the context of severe constraints on military spending. The model of consecutive enlargements seems to be exhausted, at least for the time being. The NATO-Russia-Council has failed to play a role in crisis management in the OSCE space.

The OSCE is strongly affected by increasing divergence among its participating States and by the lack of political will for pan-European co-operation. As the most comprehensive and inclusive regional institution, it is,

417

at the same time, the weakest of the major Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian international organizations. A number of governments have significantly decreased their investments in the OSCE.

The political divergence over the last decade has led to some initial indications of an emerging institutional divide. Russia and other countries in the new East have increasingly invested in different institutions, including the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) and the Customs Union, which are facing their own challenges as well.

Against this background, security community-building would require that the OSCE participating States increasingly invest in interconnecting the existing institutions in a more co-operative and efficient way.

Unfinished Integration Processes

Although integration within the OSCE space has advanced significantly since the early 1990s, it has remained unfinished. Russia and the West are no longer enemies, but they have not yet become genuine partners. There has not been much progress in shaping a new treaty on the strategic partnership between the European Union and the Russian Federation. NATO-Russia relations have remained fragile and do not live up to the 2010 Lisbon Summit promise to open "a new stage of co-operation towards a true strategic partnership". The progress achieved to date has not been sufficiently translated into resolving existing problems and conflicts.

Turkey is facing comparable integration deficits. Prospects for EU accession are uncertain and negotiations with the EU Commission have, so far, yielded only little progress. At the same time, Turkey is taking on a new role as a regional power.

No Solutions for Conflicts

The protracted conflicts have not been solved mainly because of unilateral strategies used by the parties to these conflicts and their lack of political will to find compromises. Lack of initiative and leadership plus vested interests in the continuation and instrumentalization of these conflicts have allowed many regressive steps and prevented any major breakthrough. The use of force in sub-regional conflicts is no longer taboo. Despite the efforts of the Minsk Group, a potential war over Nagorno-Karabakh is a possibility that could entail a significant danger of escalation, particularly in case of the inclusion of relevant regional powers. While conflicts in the South Caucasus, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe have not been fully resolved, new ones are looming. There is a risk of a possible spillover of conflicts from the regions adjacent to the OSCE area.

Stagnation in Arms Control

Since 1990, Europe has made historical progress in reducing its armed forces. Arms control has been one of the drivers of political rapprochement and co-

operation. However, in recent years, arms control has degenerated from an instrument of co-operative security into a bone of contention. The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), once hailed as the 'cornerstone of European security', is no longer functioning properly. Discussions aiming to unlock the situation have ended in stalemate. Success in modernizing the Vienna Document has been quite limited. The functioning of the Open Skies Treaty is hampered by disputes between individual states. The situation has been further complicated by the emergence of new issues, subjects of concern raised by various participating States, which have not yet been addressed in a proper way, such as missile defence deployments or tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. Nevertheless, the level of military transparency has remained comparatively high.

Challenges for the Observance of Human Dimension Commitments
Respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law, which, according to the 1999 OSCE Charter for European Security, "is at the core of the OSCE's comprehensive concept of security", is continuously confronted with old and new challenges. The process of democratization has been slower, less consistent and more contradictory than originally expected. A number of autocratic regimes persist in the OSCE area and have consolidated their rule. Key ingredients of democratic governance, such as the rule of law and freedom of the media are increasingly challenged throughout the OSCE area. Human rights are often abused in the context of combating terrorism. The defence of human dignity remains a fundamental challenge throughout the OSCE space. Progress in the human dimension is an indispensible element for increasing convergence among the OSCE participating States and thus for the growth of a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community.

Progress Insufficiently Translated into Joint Action
The current situation in the OSCE space is ambiguous. Advances towards greater convergence are paralleled by divergences preventing joint action. The main divergence is political and concerns a lack of cohesive policy approaches to many issues in various fields. This opens up space for parochial vested interests to create vicious cycles of old problems, old behaviour and new mistrust. Positive change requires continuous and energetic engagement by both political leaderships and societies. The building of a security community would help to narrow and close old and new gaps and the divergences currently dividing the OSCE participating States by promoting greater cohesion and convergence.

4.   *The Way towards a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian Security Community: Guiding Principles of a Strategy*

Drafting a detailed strategy for developing a security community in the OSCE area goes beyond the scope of this report. We will therefore focus here on some guidelines that can direct the process towards building a security community.

First: Economic interdependence, even if it is strong, does not lead automatically to peace and stability. Asymmetric interdependence can even produce conflicts. One therefore cannot rely on economic factors alone. Rather, states and societies must take political action. Peace is not the result of benign conditions alone. Whoever wants peace has to *make* peace through direct, focused and sustained action.

Second: Progress towards a security community is achieved through increasing convergence and overcoming divergence among the OSCE participating States and their societies with respect to reducing existing security concerns and broadening shared interests, values and identities as the basis for lasting peaceful behaviour. Pursuing the objective of a security community therefore requires enhancing the whole OSCE *acquis* in all its dimensions and a qualitatively better implementation of these commitments.

Third: Shaping the process towards a security community is more important than striving for quick fixes. A security community is not established by a single founding act. The task is not to fix the *status quo*, but rather to manage the process of ongoing change and gradually direct it towards a security community.

Fourth: It is essential to address as many issues as possible in parallel. Substantive results should be accompanied by efforts towards reconciliation and the reduction of mistrust among and within states and communities. Agreements of all kinds in as many sectors as possible – regimes, politically binding agreements, legally binding treaties etc. – add up over time to an ever denser network of mutual ties and commitments that enhance trust and make wars and violent conflicts practically impossible. This is reflected by the fact that no one – governments and peoples alike – any longer expects organized acts of violence by another state or any relevant societal group. If this state of affairs is established and assured over a longer period, one can speak of a security community.

Fifth: There should be a balance between items of the old agenda inherited from the Cold War and a new agenda related to forthcoming challenges and opportunities, including transnational threats. Neither of these agendas can be neglected. Rather, they should be dealt with in parallel. Elements of the new agenda including reconciliation, which deals with a legacy issue in a novel way, should increase in importance.

Sixth: It is important to address both potential game changers, such as developing co-operative missile defence, and relatively non-controversial

issues. Focusing on game changers alone runs the risk of their turning into spoilers where no political breakthrough can be achieved. In the same way, it is important to pursue, in a balanced way, long-term objectives, such as reconciliation, and short-term goals that can yield results relatively quickly. Early successes of any kind – even small ones – are essential, because the existing mistrust can only be reduced by deeds, not by mere declarations.

Seventh: It is imperative to depoliticize controversial issues – in general and in all individual issue areas. The degree of de-politicization achieved can be seen as a sign of success on the way towards a security community.

Eighth: We need a change in thinking. So-called 'soft issues' such as reconciliation, the rule of law including international law, people-to-people-contacts, expert communities and business co-operation might prove more important, in the long term, than so-called 'hard security' issues. This is the case because the main task ahead is changing ways of thinking, values and identities. This is even true for 'hard security' issues such as arms control, where the creation of transparency and trust and the establishment of firm bonds of co-operation are more important than setting balances and limiting military items.

Ninth: Embarking on a path towards a security community requires the active engagement of the political leaderships. At the same time, broad societal participation and ownership are essential if the process is to become robust and sustainable. This goes far beyond the traditional notion of non-governmental organizations (NGO) and includes business leaders, representatives of trade unions, religious communities, expert communities and many others. It means fostering the gradual evolution of a new culture of peaceful conflict regulation.

Tenth: As the most comprehensive and inclusive international organization in its area of application and as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations (UN), the OSCE has played and can continue to play an important role as a 'security community-building institution'. Moving ahead towards a security community would require the positive involvement and co-operation of the EU, NATO, the CSTO, the Customs Union, the OSCE and other organizations. For this reason, the OSCE should strengthen its co-operation with the UN institutions, with the regional and sub-regional organizations in its area, and with its Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation.

5.   *What the OSCE Can Contribute to Building a Security Community*

By improving their co-operation in all areas of the OSCE's activities – in the security, economic and environmental and human dimensions – the participating States can show political will and send a strong message that they

421

want to advance towards a security community. They can engage in a few selected topics and projects that are significant and visible.

5.1   Re-engaging in the Security Dimension

The long-term objective in the security dimension is the gradual demilitarization and de-securitization of interstate, and, where necessary, intrastate relations up to the point where the use of organized force is no longer thinkable. This requires a common understanding of military security, functioning arms control and military co-operation, as well as the resolution of protracted violent conflicts and the prevention of new ones, reconciliation among former adversaries and jointly addressing transnational threats and challenges.

5.1.1.   Developing Arms Control, CSBMs and Military Co-operation

The erosion of the conventional arms control regime in Europe, and specifically of the CFE Treaty, poses a challenge to the OSCE region. Sharply divergent perceptions of 'hard security' issues make concerted action to salvage arms control a matter of urgent need, but at the same time harder to achieve. The further pursuit of arms control remains an essential tool for building a co-operative and indivisible security space and thereby paving the way towards a security community. To prevent further deterioration, participating States should:

a) Abstain from steps which could jeopardize the remaining arms control regimes in Europe.
b) Exercise restraint in conventional armed forces deployments, since any substantial build-up not commensurate with national security requirements could exacerbate existing concerns.

If, however, the stalemate over CFE is overcome, new opportunities for addressing the current security concerns of the participating States could open, particularly since the dramatically changed security landscape in Europe has made many CFE provisions obsolete. The following guidelines could be helpful for participating States in pursuing a renewed arms control dialogue:

c) Consider the option of extending conventional arms control to new weapons categories and complex military capabilities.
d) Consider making new weapons categories the subject of monitoring rather than of limitations.
e) Pursue an arms control dialogue where all concerns expressed would be heard and discussed without taboos.
f) Fully engage defence establishments in the arms control dialogue.

The OSCE has a particular role to play in improving transparency and predictability by further developing confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs). This task is all the more important as the armed forces of the participating States undergo profound reductions and modernization processes.

The negotiation of a substantial Vienna Document (VD) modernization is just beginning. Participating States advocate different views with respect to which particular measures should be developed. They also differ on the issue of whether the current level of intrusiveness of the CSBMs is sufficient or whether it should be stepped up.

The main objective should be to provide for an improved baseline agreement while encouraging individual states to engage in more specific arrangements wherever appropriate. In particular, the participating States should be encouraged to provide extensive advance information about military exercises and be ready to address concerns raised by other participating States, to conclude further bilateral and regional CSBM agreements, or to practice tailored CSBMs voluntarily and unilaterally. At the same time, CSBMs, although important, should not be treated as a substitute for arms control mechanisms.

The OSCE's role in arms control and confidence- and security-building measures could be advanced through:

g) Resuming consultations with the goal of adopting a mandate for negotiations on a modern conventional arms control agreement.
h) Intensifying efforts to overcome the difficulties with the Treaty on Open Skies.
i) Conducting joint threat assessments and discussing appropriate joint responses in conjunction with national military and defence doctrines.
j) Encouraging military co-operation, including through joint training and exercises for crisis management.

5.1.2. *Taking Responsibility for Protracted Conflicts*

The protracted conflicts remain an issue of growing concern to the OSCE participating States. No genuine security community can be developed if the use of force is not ruled out. Protracted conflicts represent the context in which the fundamental principle of non-use of force is most likely to be broken. For about two decades, states have been striving to settle these conflicts, but have been unable to do so because of divergent views among the parties to the conflicts and other states involved. As long as the protracted conflicts are not solved, any discussion on a security community will lack substance.

Improving the effectiveness of the OSCE early warning, conflict prevention, resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation was a major issue during the 2010 Corfu Process and has continued to be so in the subsequent discus-

sions. Despite the progress achieved, the participating States take different views regarding which particular measures will enable the OSCE to most effectively address the challenges posed by a possible violent escalation of the protracted conflicts.

While this divergence blocks substantial progress, there is room for the OSCE to improve its performance in preventing any escalation of violence in the OSCE area. Building on the 2012 Report by the Secretary General on the progress made and possible options on the way forward with respect to the 2011 Vilnius Ministerial Council decision on the conflict cycle, the OSCE should concentrate on early warning and early action. Continued attention should be paid to innovative approaches, such as developing a conflict mediation capacity within the OSCE. The Chairmanship, in close co-operation with the Secretariat, should seek to fully utilize available tools to take appropriate action to prevent and/or to stop any escalation of violence.

5.1.3.   *Supporting Stability in Central Asia and Afghanistan*

For years, the OSCE has been fostering stability in Central Asia. Based on the mandate of the 2007 Madrid Ministerial Council meeting, which reflected the concern that the situation in Afghanistan could affect security in the OSCE area, the OSCE has also engaged in addressing relevant challenges. This has concerned, in particular, supporting measures for securing the borders between the Central Asian states and Afghanistan, intensifying the involvement of Afghan counterparts in OSCE activities related to border security and management, policing and combating drug trafficking at educational and training facilities in Central Asia and in the rest of the OSCE area, and co-ordinating its activities with the United Nations and other relevant regional and international organizations.

Now, as the anticipated deadline for the termination of the engagement of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan by the end of 2014 approaches and the international community considers strategies to ensure stability after the government of Afghanistan has taken full responsibility for the security of the country, the OSCE participating States are urged to examine whether and what adjustments need to be made in the OSCE's efforts to address the challenges of a new security environment in Afghanistan. The OSCE should:

a) Engage in intense consultations with the relevant participating States and Partners for Co-operation, particularly with the Central Asian States and with Afghanistan, in order to assess the need for adjusting current activities within the Madrid mandate.

b) Become engaged in broader international consultations, on the basis of the OSCE Platform for Co-operative Security, particularly with the United Nations, NATO, the EU and the CSTO, as well as with the relevant Partners for Co-operation, in order to co-ordinate further

activities, realize synergies and avoid unnecessary duplication of international efforts after 2014.

c) The forthcoming Dublin Ministerial Council meeting should mandate the OSCE Secretariat to undertake an examination of the OSCE's engagement subject to proper discussion within the Permanent Council and a review by a Ministerial Council meeting no later than in 2014.

5.1.4 *Encouraging Reconciliation as Means of Conflict Resolution and Rapprochement*

Reconciliation is crucial for overcoming deficits of trust in the OSCE area and finding solutions to protracted conflicts, territorial disputes and inter-ethnic, inter-religious and other tensions in various parts of Europe. While an important dimension of reconciliation consists of governmental activities, sustainable reconciliation can only be achieved through a lasting change of perceptions by the relevant societies. Reaching a basic level of mutual understanding of common history including the causes and dynamics of past conflicts remains an indispensable part of this process. Reconciliation is usually a long-term process. It cannot be seen as a tool of quick-fix crisis management.

While there is no universal template for pursuing reconciliation, the OSCE can promote reconciliation processes in significant international, transnational, inter-ethnic or other contexts. Such efforts aimed at restoring mutual respect can pave the way towards a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community.

Many OSCE activities over the last several years have focused on promoting and encouraging reconciliation, not least with respect to the protracted conflicts. The importance of these efforts should be further highlighted through concrete OSCE actions. This can be done by adjusting the priorities of OSCE institutions, or by formulating specific tasks for the Organization. The significance of reconciliation should also be reflected in the communication strategy of the OSCE. Moreover, the OSCE can focus particularly on the following objectives:

a) Identifying best practices from historical cases (France and Germany, Northern Ireland, Poland and Germany) and some of the current processes (South-Eastern Europe, Poland and Russia).

b) Identifying 'reconciliation stakeholders' at the levels of regions and states, and in civil societies, the media and business circles.

c) Supporting the parties concerned in identifying and overcoming specific 'choke points' in the process of reconciliation.

d) Standing ready to provide, upon request, a tailored set of proposals for reconciliation activities in particular conflict areas or contexts.

Specific tasks for the OSCE could include:

e) Conducting a series of seminars on the subject of 'The Link between Reconciliation, Conflict Resolution and Security in Europe: Experiences and Needs'.

f) Producing reports to summarize past reconciliation efforts (including failed ones).

g) Producing a 'Handbook of Best Practices in Reconciliation' using the aforementioned reconciliation reports.

h) Preparing and making available to interested parties a database of experts with experience in reconciliation processes.

i) Exploring possibilities for reconciliation efforts created by technological advances and new modes of social interaction and networking.

j) Devising a programme, funded by voluntary contributions, to encourage reconciliation efforts by civil societies, focusing on student exchanges, the establishment of cross-border cultural and sporting events, the funding of cross-cultural media projects, and support for regional cross-border trade fairs.

5.1.5 Addressing Transnational Threats and Challenges

For years, numerous reports by the UN, other international organizations or various NGOs have been raising the alarm about transnational threats and challenges as key concerns for international peace and stability. Among the most critical threats are the interrelated issues of trafficking in drugs, human beings and small arms and light weapons, organized crime, corruption and money laundering. Terrorism benefits greatly from these phenomena, which are rooted in economic asymmetries and social divisions, bad governance and weak or failing statehood. Climate change is also a major crisis multiplier.

Across the OSCE area, states are confronted with various forms of terrorism. States differ in their threat assessments, definitions of terrorism, interests and goals. They also differ in the ways and means they attempt to prevent and combat terrorism: Some states follow a comprehensive approach and are more focused on the processes leading to terrorism; others concentrate on searching for the motives of terrorism. In addition, combating terrorism requires a sensitive balance between the security of the state and the observance of human rights.

Cyber security is receiving increasing attention. This complex and fast-moving subject is particularly difficult to grasp from both a technological and a political point of view.

Regardless of existing differences in approaches, the last decade has shown that the OSCE participating States have found it easier to agree on joint actions to combat transnational threats than on many other issues. With its comprehensive and inclusive approach, the Organization is well equipped

426

to address this kind of issues. However, the OSCE is not the only international organization doing so. To identify its appropriate contribution to addressing transnational threats, the OSCE should enhance its interaction with other international organizations such as the UN, the EU, NATO and the CSTO and take advantage of its ties with civil societies and its Partner States.

The OSCE should further develop the agenda it has been working on in recent years – that is anti-terrorism, cyber security, anti-drugs activities, and the related field of police issues. Practical contributions could include:

a) Conducting a transparency-building seminar on 'Military Doctrines and Cyberspace: The Problem of Definitions'.

b) Launching an OSCE cyber dialogue framework on 'Joint Risk and Needs Assessments and Interstate Communication in Cases of Cyber Incidents'.

c) Conducting a series of seminars on 'Aligning National Cyber Defence Systems of Critical Infrastructures to the Most Advanced International Standards'.

d) Adopting an OSCE document on cyber security confidence-building measures.

e) Adopting a consolidated OSCE framework for the fight against terrorism.

f) Conducting regional seminars with civil society representatives on 'The OSCE Experience with Preventing Radicalization and the Problem of Identification, De-radicalization and Reintegration of (Former) Terrorist Supporters'.

g) Conducting a seminar on 'Experiences in Countering the Spread of Mafia Organizations'.

h) Elaborating a 'Handbook for Business Practitioners on Lessons Learned in Fighting Drug-Related Crime', including the international trade in chemical precursors.

i) Developing joint activities with the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF).

5.2 Engaging in the Economic and Environmental Dimension

The long-term objective in the economic and environmental dimension is a gradual process towards a converging, economically and socially prosperous region that ensures environmental sustainability. A security community will be rooted in a progressive convergence of economic policies and will increasingly interconnect the national economies between Vancouver and Vladivostok. This implies the advancement of democratic institutions, the rule of law and economic freedom. The most visible expression of this would be the creation of a free-trade and free-travel zone for the whole OSCE space.

Moving towards a security community that relies on economic freedom implies free competition. It does not rule out the possibility of conflicting interests among the various economic players. Conflicting interests are an integral part of a security community. What is essential is that disputes be resolved by peaceful means alone and that there be a strict renunciation of the use of force. This poses particular challenges with respect to political communication, joint legal and other regulatory arrangements and commercial arbitration procedures or, in other words, good economic governance at all levels.

In the *economic area*, the OSCE should focus on issues that are relevant for improving the political atmosphere among the participating States. It can neither replace specialized organizations nor interfere in the internal affairs of participating States or regional organizations. The OSCE should, however, contribute to raising awareness and developing common understanding and a gradual consensus on issues that are both controversial and symbolic, such as energy security, water management, and obstacles to economic freedom such as restricted labour migration, visa-regimes and market barriers.

In the *area of environmental protection*, the OSCE should continue to concentrate on issues that link environmental protection and sustainable development to public participation and interstate co-operation. The Organization should also discuss sensitive issues such as access to natural resources in cross-border or sub-regional contexts. It should engage in mediation in cases of disputed trans-boundary matters such as cross-border watercourses and aquifers.

The OSCE should continue its efforts to assist the participating States in implementing relevant international regulatory frameworks, particularly the 1991 UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) Espoo Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context and the 1998 UNECE Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters.

5.3   Engaging in the Human Dimension

Greater convergence of norms and identities is essential for creating the long-term conditions for a security community. This requires a better and more balanced implementation of the whole OSCE *acquis* in its human dimension (HD), more assistance with implementation, addressing new questions and challenges and elaborating related commitments, as well as initiating people-to-people programmes between different sub-regions and different strata of the populations.

5.3.1 Improving the Effectiveness of the OSCE's HD Events Cycle

Two statements in the 2005 report 'Common Purpose: Towards a More Effective OSCE' by the 'Panel of Eminent Persons' can serve as guidance for further strengthening the process of reviewing the implementation of the OSCE's human dimension commitments:

> "Monitoring of the implementation of human dimension standards is a particularly challenging and, in many situations, highly sensitive task. To encourage equal treatment and improve transparency, OSCE monitoring should be done in an unbiased and more standardized way."

> "If a Human Dimension Committee is established […], the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM) can be reduced to a maximum of five days."

Monitoring the individual states' compliance with their human dimension commitments is the basis for the subsequent implementation discussion among states and civil society actors. The objective is to monitor the compliance of all OSCE participating States, without exception, in a transparent and less politicized manner, and to connect the review process with a subsequent decision-making process in a more effective way. The following proposals might serve these objectives:

a) The OSCE's process of reviewing the implementation of its HD commitments should combine the activities of the HDIM and the Human Dimension Committee (HDC) in an integrated manner.
b) To facilitate this, and to create a common base of reference, a questionnaire-based state reporting system could be introduced. This would help the HDC to prepare the HDIMs, which, in turn, would provide feedback for further consideration by the HDC.
c) As the HDIM currently takes place in September/October, the time is frequently too short to consider its recommendations at the subsequent MC meetings. Consequently, in order to facilitate the decision-making process, the HDIM should be convened in the first half of the year.
d) If the review process were to be improved by taking these proposed steps, shortening the duration of the HDIM should be considered without changing its comprehensive agenda and the participation of NGOs.

5.3.2 Opening Dialogue with Muslim Communities

The participants of the IDEAS project have discussed the issue of the OSCE's role in fostering a dialogue between the participating States and their Muslim communities. It was argued by some participants that the OSCE has

no significant role to play, while other participants supported a dialogue-facilitator role for the organization. Based on the latter interpretation, it can be argued that in some regions within the OSCE space, political Islam is questioning the established norms and regulations of the secular state and the separation of the state and religious institutions. These problems are often aggravated by social hardship, bad governance, intolerance and discrimination. In other regions, they are frequently related to the broader issues of migration from Islam-dominated regions and the integration policies of particular states. Outside the OSCE area, the uncertain evolution of the Arab Spring shows the new dimension and urgency of these issues.

While debates with and about Muslim communities are taking place in a number of states, they usually lack a wider context. This is the point where the OSCE can bring together all those who are interested in the preservation of stability, including secular and reformist Islamic forces. Even though the issue affects different states in different ways, the OSCE could address the dilemma of mistrust between secular policymakers and political Islam. Likewise, the OSCE could initiate discussions on the commonalities and discrepancies between secular and Islamic concepts of state and nation building, democracy, rule of law, human rights, women's rights and gender equality, and education.

Building on its experience and activities related to good governance, education, and specifically fighting intolerance and discrimination, the OSCE can serve as a useful facilitator by:

a) Launching a discussion on societal confidence-building between secular governments, civil-society representatives and Islamic parties, movements and dignitaries. The goal is to overcome misunderstandings, to identify and avert sources of escalation and to prevent possible radicalization processes.

b) Initiating discussions to explore the relationship between Muslim communities and secular states in different OSCE sub-regions. Such discussions should particularly highlight positive historical and present-day experiences with the integration of Muslim communities, and involve the OSCE Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation.

c) Launching a discussion on lessons-learned in preventing radicalization with key stakeholders and opinion-shapers from Muslim communities and representatives of political Islam and integrating them into the day-to-day activities of the OSCE in areas including conflict prevention and conflict resolution.

d) Conducting a roundtable with the OSCE's Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation to enhance understanding of the ongoing processes of the Arab Spring and to engage with new political and societal forces.

5.4. *Creating an OSCE Network of Academic Institutions*

The OSCE has always been open to input from and communication with civil society actors. Transnational civic networks can foster communication and identity-building, and by so doing, contribute to creating the conditions for a security community. They can help to advance the discussion on a security community within and beyond the OSCE.

An OSCE network of academic institutions was first proposed by the OSCE Secretary General, Ambassador Lamberto Zannier. Such a network can:

a) Give advice, expertise and assistance to the OSCE and its participating States.
b) Organize the academic debate on a security community.
c) Serve as a platform for discussion of crucial issues, particularly in the context of the Irish Chairmanship's "Helsinki + 40" initiative.

The creation of an OSCE network of academic institutions can build on a number of existing elements, such as the "OSCE Security Days", which were held for the first time in June 2012 and included a large number of academic and think tank experts; the Euro-Atlantic Security Initiative (EASI) and the Initiative for the Development of a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian Security Community (IDEAS).

These existing elements can be further developed, building on the three key criteria of innovation, inclusiveness and continuity.

d) If the "OSCE Security Days" were held regularly, they could serve as a platform for exchanging ideas between the members of the network and the OSCE participating States.
e) In order to focus discussions, an annually changing key theme could be defined following consultations between the network and OSCE institutions. In addition, the Chairmanship or the Secretariat could ask the network for expertise on specific issues.
f) Discussions in Vienna might be complemented by local or sub-regional activities including those of the OSCE Academy in Bishkek. These discussions could be brought together under the banner of the "OSCE Security Days".
g) The four IDEAS institutes stand ready to participate in establishing such an OSCE Network of Academic Institutions.

5.5 *Arranging Institutional Issues*

The OSCE area is characterized by a particularly high density of regional and sub-regional international organizations. In spite of some overlaps and paral-

lelism, this institutional richness represents an important building-block for the establishment of a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community.

As a consequence, the OSCE space is not in need of new organizations. Rather, the present and future task is to improve and streamline co-operation among the existing organizations. This should also include the emerging organizations in the Eastern part of the OSCE area such as the CSTO, the Customs Union, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). The objective should be full-scale co-operation among all organizations. In this way, an ever denser network of organizations could emerge, with each organization advancing the process towards a security community according to its own characteristics and capacities. To achieve inter-institutional progress, the OSCE could observe two guidelines:

a) The potential of the emerging organizations in the Eastern part of the OSCE space should be acknowledged and they should be integrated into co-operation networks.
b) Institutionalized co-operation bodies such as the NATO-Russia Council should be able to operate effectively under all conditions.

6. A Call for the OSCE

The most important comparative advantages of the OSCE are its geographic, political and substantial comprehensiveness and inclusiveness. No other international organization stretches over three continents with 56 states and integrates such a broad array of issues relating to internal and external security. Preserving this feature at a time when divergent tendencies prevail in many areas is no small success. However, the other side of this achievement is that such an organization necessarily embraces all kinds of conflicts, tensions and contradictions among its participants. This is precisely the task the OSCE has to address.

The OSCE is primarily a reflection of the state of the relations among its 56 participating States. The more divergent the positions of its participating States, the harder it is for the OSCE to act. Conversely, the better the relations among the states, the more the OSCE is able to act in a decisive and high-profile manner. As a consequence, the Organization, particularly in politically difficult times, is more an arena for holding states together and engaging them in dialogue, and less a strong player. In terms of its ability to take action, the OSCE is a rather weak organization. In terms of its ability to continue and safeguard the political process, it is not weak at all. It is therefore no surprise that the OSCE has had difficulties in becoming more active against the background of the current political conditions.

That the OSCE is still functioning demonstrates a high level of institutional perseverance on the part of the Organization and its participating

States. The permanent security dialogue in Vienna represents a collective philosophy and practice that distinguishes Europe fundamentally from all other continents. Although the OSCE's human dimension has been a bone of contention for more than a decade, its daily operations, such as conducting human dimension events or election observation missions, do function. And although there is a deadlock in arms control, the participating States nonetheless want to maintain the OSCE's arms control *acquis*. This high degree of institutional steadiness equips the OSCE to pass through the extended period of transition that we are currently experiencing.

Paradoxically, the OSCE's relative weakness offers advantages: It is *because* it is not the decisive game-changer that it enjoys the freedom to serve as a laboratory and test field for innovative ideas – the best example is the discussion of a security community. Thus, the OSCE's opportunity lies in encouraging new thinking and in testing innovative ideas in a broad communication process with civil society actors, other international organizations and Partner States. Its opportunity lies in starting political projects that strengthen convergence among states and societies and thus clear the way towards a security community.

Forms and Forums of Co-operation in the OSCE Area

Group of Eight (G8)
Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Council of Europe (CoE)

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)
Partnership for Peace (PfP)
NATO-Russia Council
NATO-Ukraine Charter/NATO-Ukraine Commission
NATO Partners across the Globe

European Union (EU)
EU Candidate Countries
EU Association Agreements
Stabilisation and Association Agreements (SAA)

Western European Union (WEU)[1]

Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

Baltic Assembly/Baltic Council of Ministers
Barents Euro-Arctic Council
Observers to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council
Nordic Council
Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS)

Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe
Observers to the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe
Central European Free Trade Agreement/Area (CEFTA)
Central European Initiative (CEI)

---

1   The Western European Union (WEU) was officially disbanded on 30 June 2011. The prin-
     ciple of mutual defence of article V of the Modified Brussels Treaty, which the WEU was
     charged with implementing, is now contained in article 42.7 of the Treaty on European
     Union, which sets out an obligation of aid and assistance against armed aggression. Cf.
     Western European Union, *Statement of the Presidency of the Permanent Council of the
     WEU on behalf of the High Contracting Parties to the Modified Brussels Treaty – Belgium,
     France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the
     United Kingdom*, Brussels, 31 March 2010, at: http://www.weu.int/Declaration_E.pdf.

Southeast European Co-operative Initiative (SECI)
South Eastern European Co-operation Process (SEECP)
Black Sea Economic Co-operation (BSEC)

North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
Customs Union of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia

Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO)

Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO)
Observer States to the SCO
SCO Dialogue Partners

Sources:
OECD: *www.oecd.org*
Council of Europe: *www.coe.int*
NATO: *www.nato.int*
EU: *europa.eu*
CIS: *www.cis.minsk.by*
Baltic Assembly/Baltic Council of Ministers: *www.baltasam.org*
Barents Euro-Arctic Council: *www.beac.st*
Nordic Council: *www.norden.org*
CBSS: *www.cbss.org*
Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe: *www.stabilitypact.org*
CEFTA: *www.stabilitypact.org/wt2/TradeCEFTA2006.asp*
CEI: *www.ceinet.org*
SECI: *www.secicenter.org*
BSEC: *www.bsec-organization.org*
NAFTA: *www.nafta-sec-alena.org*
CSTO: *www.odkb-csto.org*
SCO: *www.sectsco.org*

The 57 OSCE Participating States – Facts and Figures[1]

1. Albania
Date of accession: June 1991
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (OSCE ranking: 40)[2]
Area: 28,748 km² (OSCE ranking: 46)[3]
Population: 3,002,859 (OSCE ranking: 42)[4]
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates:[5] 7,800
GDP growth: 2 per cent (OSCE ranking: 29)[6]
Armed forces (active): 14,245 (OSCE ranking: 36)[7]
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1995), NATO (2009), EAPC, SAA (2006), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEFTA, CEI (1996), SECI, SEECP, BSEC.

2. Andorra
Date of accession: April 1996
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 468 km² (52)
Population: 85,082 (53)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 37,200
GDP growth: -1.8 per cent (53)
Armed forces (active): none
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1994).

3. Armenia
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 29,743 km² (45)
Population: 2,970,495 (43)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 5,500
GDP growth: 4.4 per cent (15)
Armed forces (active): 48,834 (18)

---

1   Compiled by Jochen Rasch.
2   Of 57 states.
3   Of 57 states.
4   Of 57 states.
5   The international dollar is the hypothetical unit of currency used to compare different national currencies in terms of purchasing power parity. PPP is defined as the number of units of a country's currency required to buy the same amounts of goods and services in the domestic market as one US dollar would buy in the United States. See *The World Bank*, *World Development Report 2002*, Washington, DC, 2002. Because the data in this category comes from various years, it does not make sense to compare states or provide a ranking.
6   Of 53 states.
7   Of 55 states.

Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (2001), EAPC, PfP (1994), CIS (1991), BSEC, CSTO.

4. Austria
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 2.51 per cent (13)
Area: 83,871 km² (29)
Population: 8,219,743 (24)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 42,400
GDP growth: 3.1 per cent (20)
Armed forces (active): 25,758 (24)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1956), EAPC, PfP (1995), EU (1995), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1989).

5. Azerbaijan
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 86,600 km² (28)
Population: 9,493,600 (22)[8]
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 10,300
GDP growth: 0.1 per cent (49)
Armed forces (active): 66,940 (15)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (2001), EAPC, PfP (1994), CIS (1991), BSEC.

6. Belarus
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.28 per cent (30)
Area: 207,600 km² (20)
Population: 9,643,566 (21)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 15,200
GDP growth: 5.3 per cent (13)
Armed forces (active): 72,940 (13)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: EAPC, PfP (1995), CIS (1991), CEI (1996), Customs Union of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia, CSTO, SCO Dialogue Partner.

7. Belgium
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 3.24 per cent (10)
Area: 30,528 km² (44)

---

8 According to the State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan, the population of the country was 9,235,100 in 2012. The most recent census was held in 2009. Cf. http://www.azstat.org/statinfo/demoqraphic/en/AP_/1_1.xls.

Population: 10,438,353 (18)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 38,200
GDP growth: 1.9 per cent (30)
Armed forces (active): 34,336 (21)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU (1958), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

8. Bosnia and Herzegovina
Date of accession: April 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 51,197 km² (37)
Population: 3,879,296 (38)[9]
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 8,200
GDP growth: 1.7 per cent (33)
Armed forces (active): 10,577 (40)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (2002), EAPC, PfP (2006), SAA (2008),[10] Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEFTA, CEI (1992), SECI, SEECP.

9. Bulgaria
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.55 per cent (26)
Area: 110,879 km² (24)
Population: 7,037,935 (28)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 13,800
GDP growth: 1.7 per cent (33)
Armed forces (active): 31,315 (22)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1992), NATO (2004), EAPC, EU (2007), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1996), SECI, SEECP, BSEC.

10. Canada
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 5.53 per cent (7)
Area: 9,984,670 km² (2)
Population: 34,300,083 (11)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 41,100
GDP growth: 2.5 per cent (25)
Armed forces (active): 65,700 (16)

---

9   In 2013, the Federal Office of Statistics plans to carry out the first census since 1991. A pilot census was held in October 2012. Cf. http://www.fzs.ba/Eng/population.htm.
10   The Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) has been ratified but has not yet entered into force.

Memberships and forms of co-operation: G8 (1976), OECD (1961), NATO (1949), EAPC, Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, NAFTA.

11. Croatia

Date of accession: March 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.19 per cent (33)
Area: 56,594 km² (36)
Population: 4,480,043 (37)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 18,400
GDP growth: 0 per cent (50)
Armed forces (active): 18,600 (34)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1996), NATO (2009), EAPC, EU Candidate Country,[11] Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEFTA, CEI (1992), SECI, SEECP.

12. Cyprus

Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.19 per cent (33)
Area: 9,251 km² (50)[12]
Population: 1,138,071 (48)[13]
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 29,400
GDP growth: 0.5 per cent (47)
Armed forces (active): 12,000 (37)[14]
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1961), EU (2004), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

13. Czech Republic

Date of accession: January 1993
Scale of contributions: 0.57 per cent (25)
Area: 78,867 km² (30)
Population: 10,177,300 (19)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 27,400
GDP growth: 1.7 per cent (33)
Armed forces (active): 25,421 (25)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1995), CoE (1993), NATO (1999), EAPC, EU (2004), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1990/1993).

---

11   Croatia is set to become an EU member state on 1 July 2013.
12   Greek sector: 5,896 km², Turkish sector: 3,355 km².
13   Total of Greek and Turkish sectors.
14   Turkish sector: 5,000.

14. Denmark
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 2.1 per cent (14)
Area: 43,094 km² (40)
Population: 5,543,453 (29)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 37,600
GDP growth: 1.1 per cent (41)
Armed forces (active): 18,628 (33)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO
(1949), EAPC, EU (1973), Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council
(1952), CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

15. Estonia
Date of accession: September 1991
Scale of contributions: 0.19 per cent (33)
Area: 45,228 km² (39)
Population: 1,274,709 (47)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 20,600
GDP growth: 7.6 per cent (5)
Armed forces (active): 5,750 (46)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (2010), CoE (1993), NATO
(2004), EAPC, EU (2004), Baltic Assembly/Baltic Council of Ministers,
CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

16. Finland
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 1.85 per cent (16)
Area: 338,145 km² (14)
Population: 5,262,930 (32)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 36,700
GDP growth: 2.9 per cent (24)
Armed forces (active): 22,100 (29)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1969), CoE (1989), EAPC,
PfP (1994), EU (1995), Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council (1955),
CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

17. France
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 9.35 per cent (2)
Area: 643,801 km² (7)
Population: 65,630,692 (5)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 35,600
GDP growth: 1.7 per cent (33)
Armed forces (active): 238,591 (5)

Memberships and forms of co-operation: G8 (1975), OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU (1958), Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

18. Georgia
Date of accession: March 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 69,700 km² (33)
Population: 4,570,934 (36)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 5,600
GDP growth: 7 per cent (8)
Armed forces (active): 20,655 (31)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1999), EAPC, PfP (1994), BSEC.

19. Germany
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 9.35 per cent (2)
Area: 357,022 km² (13)
Population: 81,305,856 (3)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 38,400
GDP growth: 3.1 per cent (20)
Armed forces (active): 251,465 (4)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: G8 (1975), OECD (1961), CoE (1950), NATO (1955), EAPC, EU (1958), Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

20. Greece
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.98 per cent (19)
Area: 131,957 km² (23)
Population: 10,767,827 (17)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 26,600
GDP growth: -6.9 per cent (54)
Armed forces (active): 145,647 (8)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1952), EAPC, EU (1981), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, SECI, SEECP, BSEC.

21. The Holy See
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 0.44 km² (57)
Population: 836 (57)

GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: n/a
GDP growth: n/a
Armed forces (active): 110 (52)[15]
Memberships and forms of co-operation: none.

22. Hungary

Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.6 per cent (23)
Area: 93,028 km² (26)
Population: 9,958,453 (20)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 19,800
GDP growth: 1.7 per cent (33)
Armed forces (active): 22,587 (28)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1996), CoE (1990), NATO
(1999), EAPC, EU (2004), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI
(1989), SECI.

23. Iceland

Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.19 per cent (33)
Area: 103,000 km² (25)
Population: 313,183 (52)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 38,500
GDP growth: 3.1 per cent (20)
Armed forces (active): none
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1950), NATO
(1949), EAPC, EU Candidate Country, Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic
Council (1952), CBSS (1995).

24. Ireland

Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.75 per cent (21)
Area: 70,273 km² (32)
Population: 4,722,028 (34)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 40,100
GDP growth: 0.7 per cent (44)
Armed forces (active): 9,650 (42)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), EAPC,
PfP (1999), EU (1973), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

---

15 Authorized strength 110 members of the Swiss Guard, see: http://www.vatican.va/roman
_curia/swiss_guard/500_swiss/documents/rc_gsp_20060121_informazioni_it.html.

25. Italy
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 9.35 per cent (2)
Area: 301,340 km² (17)
Population: 61,261,254 (7)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 30,900
GDP growth: 0.4 per cent (48)
Armed forces (active): 184,532 (6)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: G8 (1975), OECD (1962), CoE (1949), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU (1958), Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1989).

26. Kazakhstan
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.36 per cent (28)
Area: 2,724,900 km² (4)
Population: 17,522,010 (14)[16]
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 13,200
GDP growth: 7.5 per cent (6)
Armed forces (active): 49,000 (17)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: EAPC, PfP (1994), CIS (1991), Customs Union of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia, CSTO, SCO.

27. Kyrgyzstan
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 199,951 km² (21)
Population: 5,496,737 (30)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 2,400
GDP growth: 5.7 per cent (11)
Armed forces (active): 10,900 (38)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: EAPC, PfP (1994), CIS (1991), CSTO, SCO.

28. Latvia
Date of accession: September 1991
Scale of contributions: 0.19 per cent (33)
Area: 64,589 km² (35)
Population: 2,191,580 (44)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 15,900
GDP growth: 5.5 per cent (12)

---

16   According to the Agency of Statistics of the Republic Kazakhstan, the country had a population of 16,856,000 on 1 October 2012. The most recent census was held in 2009. Cf. http://www.eng.stat.kz/Pages/default.aspx.

Armed forces (active): 4,600 (48)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1995), NATO (2004), EAPC, EU (2004), Baltic Assembly/Baltic Council of Ministers, CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

29. Liechtenstein

Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 160 km² (54)
Population: 36,713 (54)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 89,400[17]
GDP growth: -0.5 per cent[18]
Armed forces (active): none[19]
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1978), EU Association Agreement (1995), since 1923 Community of Law, Economy, and Currency with Switzerland.

30. Lithuania

Date of accession: September 1991
Scale of contributions: 0.19 per cent (33)
Area: 65,300 km² (34)
Population: 3,525,761 (40)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 19,100
GDP growth: 5.9 per cent (10)
Armed forces (active): 10,640 (39)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1993), NATO (2004), EAPC, EU (2004), Baltic Assembly/Baltic Council of Ministers, CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

31. Luxembourg

Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.47 per cent (27)
Area: 2,586 km² (51)
Population: 509,074 (50)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 81,100
GDP growth: 1 per cent (42)
Armed forces (active): 900 (51)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU (1958), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

---

17   2009 (estimated).
18   2009 (estimated).
19   In 1868, the armed forces were dissolved, see: http://www.liechtenstein.li/index.php?id=
      60&L=1.

32. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Date of accession: October 1995
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 25,713 km² (47)
Population: 2,082,370 (45)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 10,500
GDP growth: 3 per cent (23)
Armed forces (active): 8,000 (44)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1995), EAPC, PfP (1995), EU
Candidate Country, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEFTA, CEI
(1993), SECI, SEECP.

33. Malta
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 316 km² (53)
Population: 409,836 (51)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 25,800
GDP growth: 2.1 per cent (28)
Armed forces (active): 1,954 (50)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1965), EAPC, PfP
(1995/2008[20]), EU (2004), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

34. Moldova
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 33,851 km² (43)
Population: 3,656,843 (39)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 3,400
GDP growth: 6.4 per cent (9)
Armed forces (active): 5,354 (47)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1995), EAPC, PfP (1994),
CIS (1991), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEFTA, CEI (1996),
SECI, SEECP, BSEC.

35. Monaco
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 2.00 km² (56)
Population: 30,510 (56)

---

20   Malta joined the PfP in April 1995, but suspended its participation in October 1996. Malta
      re-engaged in the Partnership for Peace Programme in 2008, see: http://www.nato.int/
      docu/update/2008/04-april/e0403e.html.

446

GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 63,400[21]
GDP growth: 2.5 per cent (25)[22]
Armed forces (active): none
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (2004).

36. Mongolia

Date of accession: November 2012
Scale of contributions: 0 per cent (57)
Area: 1,564,116 km² (5)
Population: 3,179,997 (41)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 4,800
GDP growth: 17.5 per cent (1)
Armed forces (active): 10,000 (41)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: NATO Partners across the Globe, Observer State to the SCO.

37. Montenegro

Date of accession: June 2006
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 13,812 km² (49)
Population: 657,394 (49)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 11,700
GDP growth: 2.5 per cent (25)
Armed forces (active): 2,984 (49)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (2007), EAPC, PfP (2006), EU Candidate Country, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEFTA, CEI (2006), SECI, SEECP.

38. Netherlands

Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 4.36 per cent (9)
Area: 41,543 km² (41)
Population: 16,730,632 (15)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 42,700
GDP growth: 1.3 per cent (40)
Armed forces (active): 37,368 (20)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU (1958), Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

---

21   2009 (estimated).
22   2010 (estimated).

39. Norway
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 2.05 per cent (15)
Area: 323,802 km² (15)
Population: 4,707,270 (35)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 54,200
GDP growth: 1.7 per cent (33)
Armed forces (active): 24,450 (27)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU Association Agreement (1996), Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council (1952), CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

40. Poland
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 1.35 per cent (17)
Area: 312,685 km² (16)
Population: 38,415,284 (10)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 20,600
GDP growth: 4.4 per cent (15)
Armed forces (active): 100,000 (11)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1996), CoE (1991), NATO (1999), EAPC, EU (2004), Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1991).

41. Portugal
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.98 per cent (19)
Area: 92,090 km² (27)
Population: 10,781,459 (16)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 23,700
GDP growth: -1.5 per cent (52)
Armed forces (active): 42,634 (19)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1976), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU (1986), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

42. Romania
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.6 per cent (23)
Area: 238,391 km² (19)
Population: 21,848,504 (13)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 12,600
GDP growth: 2.5 per cent (25)
Armed forces (active): 73,900 (12)

Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1993), NATO (2004), EAPC, EU (2007), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1996), SECI, SEECP, BSEC.

43. Russian Federation
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 6 per cent (6)
Area: 17,098,242 km² (1)
Population: 142,517,670 (2)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 17,000
GDP growth: 4.3 per cent (17)
Armed forces (active): 956,000 (2)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: G8 (1998), CoE (1996), EAPC, PfP (1994), NATO-Russia Council (2002), CIS (1991), Barents Euro-Arctic Council, CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, BSEC, Customs Union of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia, CSTO, SCO.

44. San Marino
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 0.125 per cent (40)
Area: 61 km² (55)
Population: 32,140 (55)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 36,200[23]
GDP growth: 0.8 per cent (43)
Armed forces (active): none
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1988).

45. Serbia
Date of accession: November 2000[24]
Scale of contributions: 0.14 per cent (39)
Area: 77,474 km² (31)
Population: 7,276,604 (27)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 10,800
GDP growth: 1.8 per cent (32)
Armed forces (active): 28,184 (23)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (2003), EAPC, PfP (2006), EU Candidate Country, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEFTA, CEI (1989/2000), SECI, SEECP, BSEC.

46. Slovakia
Date of accession: January 1993
Scale of contributions: 0.28 per cent (30)

---

23   2009.
24   Yugoslavia was suspended from 7 July 1992 to 10 November 2000.

Area: 49,035 km² (38)
Population: 5,483,088 (31)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 23,600
GDP growth: 3.3 per cent (19)
Armed forces (active): 15,799 (35)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (2000), CoE (1993), NATO (2004), EAPC, EU (2004), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1990/1993).

47. Slovenia
Date of accession: March 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.22 per cent (32)
Area: 20,273 km² (48)
Population: 1,996,617 (46)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 29,000
GDP growth: -0.2 per cent (51)
Armed forces (active): 7,600 (45)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (2010), CoE (1993), NATO (2004), EAPC, EU (2004), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1992), SECI, SEECP.

48. Spain
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 4.58 per cent (8)
Area: 505,370 km² (9)
Population: 47,042,984 (8)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 31,000
GDP growth: 0.7 per cent (44)
Armed forces (active): 143,006 (9)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1977), NATO (1982), EAPC, EU (1986), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

49. Sweden
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 3.24 per cent (10)
Area: 450,295 km² (11)
Population: 9,103,788 (23)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 40,900
GDP growth: 4 per cent (18)
Armed forces (active): 20,363 (32)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), EAPC, PfP (1994), EU (1995), Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Nordic Council (1952), CBSS (1992), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

50. Switzerland
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 2.81 per cent (12)
Area: 41,277 km² (42)
Population: 7,925,517 (25)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 43,900
GDP growth: 1.9 per cent (30)
Armed forces (active): 25,287 (26)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1963), EAPC, PfP (1996), EU Association Agreement (rejected by referendum), Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

51. Tajikistan
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 143,100 km² (22)
Population: 7,768,385 (26)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 2,100
GDP growth: 7.4 per cent (7)
Armed forces (active): 8,800 (43)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: EAPC, PfP (2002), CIS (1991), CSTO, SCO.

52. Turkey
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 1.01 per cent (18)
Area: 783,562 km² (6)
Population: 79,749,461 (4)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 14,700
GDP growth: 8.5 per cent (3)
Armed forces (active): 510,600 (3)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1952), EAPC, EU Candidate Country, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, SECI, SEECP, BSEC, SCO Dialogue Partner.

53. Turkmenistan
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.05 per cent (49)
Area: 488,100 km² (10)
Population: 5,054,828 (33)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 7,900
GDP growth: 14.7 per cent (2)
Armed forces (active): 22,000 (30)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: EAPC, PfP (1994), CIS (1991).

54. Ukraine
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.68 per cent (22)
Area: 603,550 km² (8)
Population: 44,854,065 (9)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 7,300
GDP growth: 5.2 per cent (14)
Armed forces (active): 129,925 (10)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: CoE (1995), EAPC, PfP (1994), NATO-Ukraine Charter/NATO-Ukraine Commission (1997), CIS (1991)[25], Observer to the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, CEI (1996), BSEC.

55. United Kingdom
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 9.35 per cent (2)
Area: 243,610 km² (18)
Population: 63,047,162 (6)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 36,600
GDP growth: 0.7 per cent (44)
Armed forces (active): 174,030 (7)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: G8 (1975), OECD (1961), CoE (1949), NATO (1949), EAPC, EU (1973), Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

56. USA
Date of accession: June 1973
Scale of contributions: 11.5 per cent (1)
Area: 9,826,675 km² (3)
Population: 313,847,465 (1)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 49,000
GDP growth: 1.7 per cent (33)
Armed forces (active): 1,569,417 (1)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: G8 (1975), OECD (1961), NATO (1949), EAPC, Observer to the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, NAFTA.

57. Uzbekistan
Date of accession: January 1992
Scale of contributions: 0.35 per cent (29)
Area: 447,400 km² (12)
Population: 28,394,180 (12)
GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates: 3,300
GDP growth: 8.3 per cent (4)

---

25   Although Ukraine was a founding state of the CIS, it has never ratified the CIS Charter.

Armed forces (active): 67,000 (14)
Memberships and forms of co-operation: EAPC, PfP (1994), CIS (1991), CSTO, SCO.

Sources:
Date of accession:
http://web.archive.org/web/20100826040207/http://www.osce.org/about/131 31.html

Scale of contributions:
OSCE, Decision of the Permanent Council, PC.DEC/1027 Annex, 22 December 2011. http://www.osce.org/pc/86722

Area:
https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/rawdata_2147.txt

Population:
(estimated as of July 2012) https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/rawdata_2119.txt

GDP per capita in international dollars at PPP rates:
(estimated as of 2011, unless stated to the contrary) https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2004rank.html

GDP growth:
(estimated as of 2011, unless stated to the contrary) https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2003rank.html

Armed forces (active):
International Institute for Strategic Studies (ed.), The Military Balance 2012, London 2012

OSCE Conferences, Meetings, and Events 2011/2012

2011

7-9 September	OSCE Office in Yerevan/Armenian Civil Service Council/European Union Project "Sigma"/UNDP: International Conference on Reforming Civil Service, Yerevan
12 September	OSCE Chairmanship/Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR): High-level meeting on "Preventing and Responding to Hate Incidents and Crimes against Christians", Rome
14-16 September	Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA): 19th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum on the *"Promotion of Common Actions and Co-operation in the OSCE Area in the Fields of Development of Sustainable Energy and Transport"*, Prague
21-23 September	OSCE Centre in Ashgabat/Office of the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media (RFOM): Training for press secretaries and government press officers, Ashgabat
26 September	ODIHR: Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, Warsaw
3-4 October	OSCE Secretariat, Office of the Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings: Expert seminar on leveraging anti-money laundering regimes to combat human trafficking, Vienna
4-5 October	OSCE Secretariat, Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU)/Ministry of the Interior of the Kyrgyz Republic: National workshop on community policing tools to counter violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism, Bishkek
7-10 October	OSCE Parliamentary Assembly: Fall Meeting, Dubrovnik
10-11 October	OSCE Secretariat, Section for External Co-operation: 2011 OSCE Mediterranean Conference, Budva
13-14 October	RFOM: First South East Europe Media Conference, Sarajevo
20-21 October	RFOM: Eighth South Caucasus Media Conference "Pluralism and Internet Governance", Tbilisi
27-28 October	OSCE Secretariat, Gender Section: UNSCR 1325 conference "Moving beyond Theory to Maximize Security in the OSCE", Sarajevo

28 October	OSCE Chairmanship/ODIHR: Meeting on "Confronting Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims in Public Discourse", Vienna
31 October-4 November	ODIHR: Training course on human rights and the investigation of terrorist crimes, Pristina and Skopje
10-11 November	ODIHR: Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting on Prevention of Racism, Xenophobia and Hate Crimes through Educational and Awareness-Raising Initiatives, Vienna
4-5 December	ODIHR: OSCE-Mediterranean Partner Countries' Civil Society Conference, Vilnius
6-7 December	Lithuanian OSCE Chairmanship: 18th OSCE Ministerial Council, Vilnius
9 December	OSCE Secretariat, ATU and Strategic Police Matters Unit (SPMU), in co-operation with the Turkish National Police Academy: Panel on the role of community policing to prevent violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism, Antalya
12 December	ODIHR: OSCE expert roundtable on preventing women terrorist radicalization, Vienna
12-13 December	OCEEA/Transport Division of the UNECE: Inland Transport Security Discussion Forum, OSCE-UNECE Roundtable, Vienna

2012

1 January	Ireland takes over the OSCE Chairmanship from Lithuania. Eamon Gilmore, Ireland's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade becomes Chairman-in-Office
26-27 January	ODIHR/ATU/ SPMU: Expert roundtable on preventing terrorism and countering violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism: a community policing approach, Warsaw
6-7 February	Chairmanship/OCEEA: First Preparatory Meeting of the 20th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum on "Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism", Vienna
13-14 February	OSCE/Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand: OSCE-Thailand Conference on "Strengthening Security through Regional Co-operation", Chiang Mai
14 February	ODIHR: Expert meeting on hate crime data collection practice across the OSCE region, Warsaw

23-24 February	OSCE Parliamentary Assembly: Winter Meeting, Vienna
12-13 March	Secretariat, Gender Section: Expert roundtable on the role and empowerment of women in countering violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism, Vienna
16 March	OSCE Secretariat's Transnational Threats Department (TNT)/ODIHR: Launch of online forum on preventing terrorism and countering violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism: a community policing approach
26-28 March	OSCE RFOM/Albany Associates: Broadcast Regulation Master Class, Istanbul
27-28 March	ODIHR: Expert group meeting on "Human Rights Protection in the Return of Trafficked Persons"; Warsaw
27-31 March	ODIHR/OSCE Border Management Staff College (BMSC): Training of border officials on the protection of human rights while countering terrorism, Dushanbe
3-4 April	ODIHR: Meeting on "Access to Justice and Effective Remedies for Victims of Trafficking: Establishing a Network of Lawyers", Warsaw
18-19 April	ODIHR: Roundtable for civil society on hate crimes data collection and confronting intolerance, Vienna
19 April	ODIHR/Parliament of Georgia: Conference on codes and standards of ethics for parliamentarians, Tbilisi
19-20 April	ODIHR: Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting on Combating Racism, Intolerance and Discrimination in Society through Sport, Vienna
23-24 April	OSCE Chairmanship/OCEEA: Second Preparatory Meeting of the 20th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum on "Promoting Good Governance and Combating Corruption in Support of Socio-Economic Development", Dublin
8-10 May	The Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office for Article IV of Annex 1B of the Dayton Peace Accords: Eighth Review Conference of Article IV, Annex 1B of the Dayton Peace Agreement, Rome
10-11 May	OSCE/UNODC: Conference on "Enhancing the Implementation of International Instruments on Terrorist Use of Explosive Substances", Vienna
12-14 May	OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Economic Conference, Batumi
14-16 May	ODIHR: Human Dimension Seminar on the rule of law framework for combating trafficking in human beings, Warsaw

21-25 May	OSCE Secretariat, ATU: Online forum on the internet as tactical facilitator for terrorists
24 May	ODIHR/European Network of Independent Living: Workshop on combating hate crimes against people with disabilities, Dublin
5-6 June	OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC)/United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA): Workshop on implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1540, Vilnius
18-19 June	OSCE Chairmanship: Dublin Conference on Internet Freedom, Dublin
18-20 June	OSCE CPC, in co-operation with Latvia, and with Germany and Switzerland as donors: Seminar on the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security for the Baltic Sea region, Riga
24-25 June	OSCE: 2012 OSCE Security Days, Vienna
26-27 June	ODIHR: Seminar on the role of civil society in combating hate crimes against Christians, Rome
26-28 June	OSCE: Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC), Vienna
3-4 July	ODIHR: Second expert meeting on hate crime data monitoring and data collection, Warsaw
5-6 July	OSCE RFOM: Central Asia Media Conference "From Traditional to Online Media: Best Practices and Perspectives", Ashgabat
5-6 July	ODIHR: Prosecuting hate crimes. Consultation meeting and pilot training, Warsaw
5-9 July	OSCE Parliamentary Assembly: 21st Annual Session, Monaco
11 July	Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC): Discussion on implementation of the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, Vienna
12-13 July	Chairmanship/ODIHR: Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting on Democratic Elections and Election Observation, Vienna
20-25 July	OCEEA/OSCE BMSC /UNECE Transport Division: Regional training seminar on best practices at border crossings, Dushanbe
26-27 July	OSCE, ATU/Kyrgyzstan Antiterrorism Centre of the State Committee on National Security: Expert meeting of antiterrorist centres, Bishkek

Ute Runge

OSCE Selected Bibliography 2011/2012

Documents

Georgia, Parliament/ODIHR, Conference: Codes and Standards of Ethics for Parliamentarians, Tbilisi, Georgia, 19 April 2012, Final Report, [Warsaw 2012].

ODIHR, Annual Report 2011, Warsaw 2012.

ODIHR, Background Paper on Addressing Transnational Threats and Challenges in the OSCE Region: The Human Dimension, OSCE Annual Security Review Conference, Vienna, 26-28 June 2012, [Warsaw] 2012, ODIHR.GAL/38/12.

ODIHR, The Death Penalty in the OSCE Area, Background Paper 2011, Warsaw 2011.

ODIHR, Guidelines for Educators on Countering Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims. Addressing Islamophobia through Education, Warsaw 2011.

ODIHR, Handbook on Media Monitoring for Election Observation Missions, Warsaw 2012.

ODIHR, Handbook on Monitoring Freedom of Peaceful Assembly, Warsaw 2011.

ODIHR, Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region. Incidents and Responses, Annual Report for 2010, Warsaw 2011.

ODIHR, Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, Consolidated Summary, Warsaw, 26 September - 7 October 2011, Warsaw 2011.

ODIHR, Law Drafting and Legislative Process in the Republic of Serbia. An Assessment, December 2011, Warsaw 2011.

ODIHR, Opinion on the Draft Law of the Republic of Armenia on Making Amendments and Supplements to the Law on Alternative Service and on the Draft Law on Making Supplements to the Law on the Enforcement of the Criminal Code, Warsaw 2012.

ODIHR, OSCE Human Dimension Seminar Rule of Law Framework for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Consolidated Summary, Warsaw, 14-16 May 2012, Warsaw 2012, ODIHR.GAL/35/12.

ODIHR, Report, Trial Monitoring in Belarus (March-July 2011), Warsaw 2011, ODIHR.GAL/67/11.

ODIHR, Roundtable on the Contemporary Forms of Racism and Xenophobia Affecting People of African Descent in the OSCE Region, Vienna, 10 November 2011, Summary Meeting Report, Warsaw 2012, ODIHR.GAL/81/11/Corr.1.

ODIHR, Social and Economic Inclusion of Women from Migrant Households in Tajikistan, Assessment Report, Warsaw 2012.

ODIHR, Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting "Promotion of Pluralism in New Media", 7-8 July 2011, Hofburg, Vienna, Final Report, Vienna 2011, PC.SHDM.GAL/9/11/Rev.1.

ODIHR, Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting, Prevention of Racism, Xenophobia and Hate Crimes through Educational and Awareness-Raising Initiatives, 10-11 November 2011, Vienna, Final Report, Vienna 2012, ODIHR.GAL/82/11.

ODIHR, Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting, Combating Racism, Intolerance and Discrimination in Society through Sport, 19-20 April 2012, Vienna, Final Report, Vienna 2012, PC.SHDM.GAL/5/12.

ODIHR/Council of Europe, Venice Commission, Joint Opinion on the Draft Law on Election of People's Deputies of Ukraine, Adopted by the Council of Democratic Elections at Its 38th Meeting (Venice, 13 October 2011) and by the Venice Commission at Its 88th Plenary Session (Venice, 14-15 October 2011), Strasbourg 2011.

ODIHR/Council of Europe, Venice Commission, Joint Opinion on the Draft Law on Freedoms of Conscience and Religion and the Laws Making Amendments and Supplements to the Criminal Code, the Administrative Offences Code and the Law on the Relations between the Republic of Armenia and the Holy Armenian Apostolic Church of the Republic of Armenia, Adopted by the Venice Commission at Its 88th Plenary Session (Venice, 14-15 October 2011), Strasbourg 2011.

ODIHR/Council of Europe, Venice Commission, Joint Opinion on the Revised Electoral Code of "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Adopted by the Council for Democratic Elections at Its 38th Meeting (Venice, 13 October 2011) and by the Venice Commission at Its 88th Plenary Session (Venice, 14-15 October 2011), Strasbourg 2011.

ODIHR/Council of Europe, Venice Commission, Joint Opinion on the Act on the Elections of Members of Parliament of Hungary, Adopted by the Council for Democratic Elections at Its 41st Meeting (Venice, 14 June 2012) and Venice Commission at Its 91st Plenary Session (Venice, 15-16 June 2012), Strasbourg 2012.

ODIHR/OSCE, Centre in Bishkek/Kyrgyz Republic, Central Election Commission/International Foundation for Electoral Systems/United Nations Development Program, Election Dispute Resolution in the Kyrgyz Republic, Roundtable Report, Bishkek, 29 May 2012, [Warsaw] 2012.

Open Skies Consultative Commission, United States Delegation, Open Skies Treaty Observation Flights. From Entry-Into-Force to December 2011, [Vienna] 2012, OSCC.DEL/5/12/Corr.1.

OSCE, Meaningful Steps. Report on Progress Made During Lithuania's Chairmanship of the OSCE, 2011, Vilnius 2011, MC.GAL/13/11/Corr.1.

460

OSCE, Chairman-in-Office/ODIHR, Summary Report of the OSCE High-Level Meeting on Preventing and Responding to Hate Incidents and Crimes against Christians, 12 September 2011, Rome, Warsaw 2011, CIO.GAL/230/11.

OSCE, Chairman-in-Office/ODIHR, Summary Report of the OSCE High-Level Meeting on Confronting Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslim in Public Discourse, Vienna, 27-28 October 2011, Warsaw 2012, ODIHR.GAL/80/11/Corr.1.

OSCE, Economic and Environmental Forum, Nineteenth Economic and Environmental Forum, Concluding Meeting, "Promotion of Common Actions and Co-operation in the OSCE Area in the Fields of Development of Sustainable Energy and Transport", Prague, 14-16 September 2011, Consolidated Summary, Vienna 2011, EEF.GAL/17/11.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation, The Continuing Implementation of the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition. FSC Chairperson's Progress Report to the Eighteenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, Vilnius 2011.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation, Efforts in the Field of Arms Control Agreements and Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in Accordance with Its Mandate. FSC Chairperson's Progress Report to the Eighteenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, Vilnius 2011.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation, Efforts to Further Improve the Implementation of the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security. FSC Chairperson's Progress Report to the Eighteenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, Vilnius 2011.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation, Efforts to Support Implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004) in the OSCE Region. FSC Chairperson's Progress Report to the Eighteenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, Vilnius 2011.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation, OSCE Meeting to Review the OSCE Plan of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons and OSCE Expert Level Session on Small Arms and Light Weapons Stockpile Management, Surplus Reduction and Destruction, Vienna, 22 to 24 May 2012, Consolidated Report, Vienna 2012, FSC.GAL/86/12.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation, Vienna Document 2011 on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures, Vienna 2011, FSC.DOC/1/11.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation/OSCE, Permanent Council, 50th Joint Meeting of the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Permanent Council, Vienna 2011, FSC-PC.JOUR/37.

OSCE, Forum for Security Co-operation/OSCE, Permanent Council, 51st Joint Meeting of the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Permanent Council, Vienna 2012, FSC-PC.JOUR/38.

461

OSCE, Ministerial Council, Eighteenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, 6 and 7 December 2011, Vilnius 2011, Decisions of the Ministerial Council, Ministerial Declaration on Combating all Forms of Human Trafficking, Reports by the Chairmanship, Statements by Delegations, Reports to the Ministerial Council, Vilnius 2011.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Maintenance of Orthodox Graveyards in Kosovo, [Pristina] 2011.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Municipal Act. Relationships between Central and Local Institutions, [Pristina] 2011.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Municipal Responses to Security Incidents Affecting Communities in Kosovo and the Role of Municipal Community Safety Councils, [Pristina] 2011.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Access to Civil Registration in Kosovo, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Community Rights Assessment Report, Third Edition, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Execution of Judgements, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Humanitarian Bus Transportation in Kosovo after Transfer to Kosovo*, Institutions Monitoring Findings, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Implementation Measures for Legislation Impacting Human Rights in Kosovo, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Independence of the Judiciary in Kosovo: Institutional and Functional Dimensions, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, Municipal Assembly Follow-Up Monitoring Report, January-December 2011, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, The State of Independent Institutions in Kosovo, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission in Kosovo, 2012 Budget Development Process in Kosovo Municipalities: An Assessment, [Pristina] 2012.

OSCE, Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina, The Right to Social Protection in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Concerns and Adequacy and Equality, Sarajevo 2012.

OSCE, Mission to Serbia/Belgrade Centre for Human Rights, Attitudes towards War Crimes Issues, ICTY and the National Judiciary, [Belgrade 2011].

OSCE, Office in Baku, Trial Monitoring Report Azerbaijan 2010, Baku 2012.

OSCE, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, Activity Report 2010-11, Vienna 2011.

OSCE, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, Economic and Environmental Forum, 20 Years, Vienna 2012.

OSCE, Secretariat, Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE Guide on Non-Military Confidence-Building Measures (CBMs), Vienna 2012.

462

OSCE, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, Twentieth Economic and Environmental Forum "Promoting Security and Stability through Good Governance". First Preparatory Meeting "Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism", Vienna, 6-7 February 2012, Consolidated Summary, Vienna 2012, EEF.GAL/10/12.

OSCE, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, Twentieth Economic and Environmental Forum "Promoting Security and Stability through Good Governance". Second Preparatory Meeting "Promoting Good Governance and Combating Corruption in Support of Socio-Economic Development", Dublin, Ireland, 23-24 April 2012, Consolidated Summary, Vienna 2012, EEF.GAL/16/12.

OSCE, Office of the Secretary General, Action against Terrorism Unit, OSCE Workshop on Public-Private Partnership on Enhancing Tourism Security. Executive Report, 8-9 September 2011, Vienna, Austria, Vienna 2011, SEC.GAL/174/11.

OSCE, Office of the Secretary General, Section for External Co-operation, 2011 OSCE Mediterranean Conference, Democratic Transformation: Challenges and Opportunities in the Mediterranean Region, Budva, Montenegro, 10-11 October 2011, Consolidated Summary, [Vienna] 2012, SEC.GAL/199/11.

OSCE, Office of the Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, An Agenda for Prevention: Activities and Challenges in 2011. 2011 Annual Report of the Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings presented to the Permanent Council 15 December 2011, Vienna 2011.

OSCE, Office of the Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, An Agenda for Prevention: Trafficking for Labour Exploitation, Vienna 2011.

OSCE, Parliamentary Assembly, Monaco Declaration and Resolutions Adopted by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly at the 21st Annual Session, Monaco, 5 to 9 July 2012, [Monaco] 2012, PA.GAL/5/12.

OSCE, Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine/Foreign & Commonwealth Office/ Institute of Rural Development, National and International Mechanisms of Funding Civil Society Organisations. International Practices on Confidence-Building Measures between the State and Civil Society, Kyiv 2011.

OSCE, Representative on Freedom of the Media, Access to Information and New Technologies. 12th Central Asia Media Conference, Dushanbe, Tajikistan 25-26 May 2010, Vienna 2011.

OSCE, Representative on Freedom of the Media, Commitments: Freedom of the Media, Freedom of Expression, Free Flow of Information, 1975-2011, 2nd Edition, [Vienna 2011].

463

OSCE, Representative on Freedom of the Media, Pluralism and Internet Governance, 13th Central Asia Media Conference, Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 29-30 November 2011, Vienna 2012.

OSCE, Representative on Freedom of the Media, Pluralism and Internet Governance, 8th South Caucasus Media Conference, Tbilisi, Georgia, 20-21 October 2011, Vienna 2012.

OSCE, Representative on Freedom of the Media, Yearbook 12, 2010, Vienna 2011.

OSCE, Representative on Freedom of the Media, Yearbook 13, 2011, Vienna 2012.

OSCE, Secretariat, Conflict Prevention Centre, Survey of OSCE Field Operations, Vienna 2011, SEC.GAL/171/11/Corr.1.

OSCE, Secretariat, Conflict Prevention Centre, Updated Summary Report on Replies Provided by Participating States on the One-Off Information Exchange with Regard to OSCE Principles on the Control and Brokering in Small Arms and Light Weapons, Vienna 2012, FSC.GAL/98/12.

OSCE, Secretariat, Transnational Threats Department, Action against Terrorism Unit, Annual Report of the Secretary General on Police-Related Activities 2011, Submitted in Accordance with Decision 9, Paragraph 6, of the Bucharest Ministerial Council Meeting, 4 December 2001, Vienna 2012, SEC.DOC/1/12.

OSCE, Secretariat, Transnational Threats Department, Action against Terrorism Unit, Status in the OSCE Area of the Universal Anti-Terrorism Conventions and Protocols as well as Other International and regional Legal Instruments Related to Terrorism and Co-operation in Criminal Matters, [Vienna] 2012.

OSCE, Secretary General, Annual Report on OSCE Activities 2010, Vienna 2011.

OSCE, Secretary General, Annual Report on OSCE Activities 2011, Vienna 2012.

OSCE, Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Report by OSCE Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Following Her Visit to the Republic of Moldova, 31 October - 3 November 2011, [Vienna] 2012, SEC.GAL/147/12.

United States, Congress, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (U.S. Helsinki Commission), Briefing: Mongolia Moves Toward Europe, October 12, 2011, [Washington] 2011 (Unofficial Transcript).

United States, Congress, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, (U.S. Helsinki Commission), Briefing: Elections in the Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, May 23, 2012 [Washington] 2012 (Unofficial Transcript).

United States, Congress, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (U.S. Helsinki Commission), Hearing: Conflicts in the Caucasus: Pro-

spects for Resolution, December 7, 2011, [Washington] 2011, (Unofficial Transcript).

United States, Congress, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (U.S. Helsinki Commission), Hearing: The Escalation of Violence against Roma in Europe, February 15, 2012 [Washington] 2012, (Unofficial Transcript).

United States, Congress, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (U.S. Helsinki Commission), Hearing: Kazakhstan: As Stable as Its Government Claims? January 25, 2012 [Washington] 2012, (Unofficial Transcript).

United States, Congress, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (U.S. Helsinki Commission), Hearing: Georgia's Parliamentary Election: How Free and Fair Has the Campaign Been, and How Should the U.S. Government Respond? September 20, 2012 [Washington D.C.] 2012 (Unofficial Transcript).

Monographs and Anthologies

Akdeniz, Yaman, Freedom of Expression on the Internet. A Study of Legal Provisions and Practices Related to Freedom of Expression, the Free Flow of Information and Media Pluralism on the Internet in OSCE Participating States, Vienna 2012.

Azimov, Ulugbek/Dianara Sayakova, Monitoring the Right to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly in the Kyrgyz Republic. Results, Conclusions, Recommendations, Bishkek 2011.

Benedek, Wolfgang/Florence Benoît-Rohmer/Wolfram Karl/Manfred Nowak (eds), European Yearbook on Human Rights 2012, Antwerp 2012.

Bilandžić, Vladimir/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade. The First CSCE Follow-up Meeting and the Crisis of Détente, Internationale Beziehungen. Theorie und Geschichte 10, Göttingen 2012.

Boonstra, Jos, Democracy in Central Asia: Sowing in Unfertile Fields? EUCAM Policy Brief 23, Madrid 2012.

Brzoska, Michael/Anne Finger/Oliver Meier/Götz Neuneck/Wolfgang Zellner, Prospects for Arms Control in Europe, Berlin 2011.

Butenschøn, Nils A./Kåre Vollan, Electoral Quotas and the Challenges of Democratic Transition in Conflict-Ridden Societies, NORDEM Special Report, Oslo 2011.

Evers, Frank, The OSCE Summit in Astana. Expectations and Results, CORE Working Paper 23, Hamburg 2011.

Evers, Frank, OSCE Conflict Management and the Kyrgyz Experience in 2010. Advanced Potentials, Lack of Will, Limited Options, CORE Working Paper 24, Hamburg 2012.

Freire, Maria Raquel/Roger E. Kanet (eds), Russia and Its Near Neighbours, Basingstoke 2012.

Gogidze, Lasha, Case Study: The Georgian Parliament's Code of Ethics – Implementation and Recommendations for Reform, [Tbilisi 2012].

Hakkarainen, Petri, A State of Peace in Europe. West Germany and the CSCE, 1966 - 1975, New York 2011.

Hartmann, Rüdiger/Hans-Joachim Schmidt, Konventionelle Rüstungskontrolle in Europa – Wege in die Zukunft, HSFK Report 6/2011, Frankfurt am Main 2011.

Herman, Kristine (ed.), Gender Mainstreaming in Aarhus Activities. A Guideline for Practioners, Vienna 2012.

International Crisis Group (ed.), Armenia: An Opportunity for Statesmanship, Europe Report 217, Yerevan 2012.

International Crisis Group (ed.), Kyrgyzstan: Widening Ethnic Divisions in the South, Asia Report 222, Bishkek 2012.

International Crisis Group (ed.), Setting Kosovo Free: Remaining Challenges, Europe Report 218, Pristina 2012.

International Crisis Group (ed.), Tackling Azerbaijan's IDP Burden, Europe Briefing 67, Baku 2012.

Isachenko, Daria, The Making of Informal States. Statebuilding in Northern Cyprus and Transdniestria, Rethinking Peace and Conflict Studies, Basingstoke 2012.

Jenichen, Anne, Politische Innovation in internationalisierten Nachkriegskontexten: Bosnische Frauenrechtspolitik in vergleichender Perspektive, Wiesbaden 2012.

Kirchner, Emil J./Roberto Domínguez (eds), The Security Governance of Regional Organizations, Global Institutions 58, London 2011.

Liechtenstein, Stephanie/Walter Kemp, The OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership and the Arab Uprisings, Vienna 2011.

Marat, Erica, OSCE Police Reform Programs in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan: Past Constraints and Future Opportunities, EUCAM Policy Brief 27, Madrid 2012.

Mendee, Jargalsaikhan, Mongolia's Quest for Third Neighbours: Why the European Union? EUCAM Policy Brief 25, Madrid 2012.

Mijatović, Dunja, Protection of Journalists from Violence, Commissioner for Human Rights Issue Paper 3/2011, Strasbourg 2011.

Navasardian, Boris, Parliamentary Elections in Armenia: From Decorative to Genuine Democracy? Berlin 2012.

Peyrouse, Sébastien/Jos Boonstra/Marlène Laruelle, Security and Development in Central Asia. The EU Compared to China and Russia, EUCAM Working Paper 11, Madrid 2012.

466

Seifert, Arne C., Zentralasien. Politischer Islam, politischer Prozess, Transformation, Schriften zur internationalen Politik 37, Berlin 2011.

Sender, Wolfgang, Russland und die Wahlbeobachtungen der OSZE. Eine empirische Studie zu den Ursachen des Widerstands der Putin-Administration gegen das ODIHR, Frankfurt am Main 2012.

Shamshidov, Kushtarbek/Pal Dunay/Graeme P. Herd/Maxim Ryabkov, The 4th GCSP-OSCE Academy-NUPI-NESA-GCMC Seminar "Central Asia 2011", September 2011, Bishkek, Geneva Papers, Conference Series 24, Geneva 2012.

Thielmann, Georg, Mission und Ungewissheit. Wie internationale Organisationen durch veränderte Aufgaben und sich ändernde Klimata beeinflusst werden. Eine Analyse der Ursachen für Erfolg und Misserfolg an den Beispielen der OSZE- und der Bundeswehrentwicklung im Kosovo, Nordhausen 2011.

Zellner, Wolfgang/Yves Boyer/Frank Evers/Isabelle Facon/Camille Grand/ Ulrich Kühn/Łukasz Kulesa/Andrei Zagorski, Towards a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian Security Community. From Vision to Reality, Hamburg 2012.

Articles

Ackermann, Alice, Strengthening the OSCE's Capacities in Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Conflict Resolution, in: Security and Human Rights 1/2012, pp. 11-18.

Anin, Anatoly/Rodion Ayumov, Conventional Forces in Europe: Yesterday, Today … Tomorrow? …, Part 2, in: Security Index 4/2011, pp. 15-28.

Azimov, Anvar, OSCE: The Search for Its Niche is Ongoing, in: International Affairs (Minneapolis, MN) 2/2012, pp. 19-22.

Bader, Max, OSCE Electoral Assistance and the Role of Election Commissions, in: Security and Human Rights 1/2012, pp. 19-29.

Bange, Oliver, "The Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number ...". The FRG and the GDR and the Belgrade CSCE Conference (1977-78), in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 225-254.

Baev, Jordan, Bulgaria and the Warsaw Pact Consultations on the CSCE Process: From Helsinki to Belgrade, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 107-118.

Biermann, Harald, U.S. Perceptions of the CSCE Process, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 143-161.

Bloed, Arie, Chronicle: Mongolia Wants to Join the OSCE, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 411-414.

Bloed, Arie, Chronicle: Russian Elections Cause Turmoil, in: Security and Human Rights 1/2012, pp. 65-69.

Bordyuzha, Nikolai, CSTO: 10 Years of Countering Threats and Challenges, in: International Affairs (Minneapolis, MN) 5/2011, pp. 40-49.

Brandt, Max, Armenien vs. Aserbaidschan: Auf der Schwelle zum Krieg, in: Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik 6/2012, pp. 32-35.

Bugajski, Janusz/Besian Boçka/Dovile Sukyte (eds), Lithuania's OSCE Chairmanship, in: Wider Europe Fall/2011, pp. 3-5.

Čavoški, Jovan, On the Road to Belgrade: Yugoslavia's Contribution to the Defining of the Concept of European Security and Cooperation 1975-1977, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 83-106.

Chernyavsky, Stanislav, Russian Diplomacy and the Nagorno-Karabakh Settlement, in: International Affairs (Minneapolis, MN) 2/2012, pp. 155-169.

Crawford, Dorn, Tactical Nuclear Weapons and NATO: A Conventional Arms Control Perspective, in: Tom Nichols/Douglas Stuart/Jeffrey D. McCausland (eds), Tactical Nuclear Weapons and NATO, Carlisle, PA 2012, pp. 437-454.

Czymmeck, Anja/Kristina Viciska, Ein Zukunftsmodell für multiethnisches Zusammenleben? Bilanz nach zehn Jahren Ohrid-Rahmenabkommen in Mazedonien, in: KAS Auslandsinformationen 11/2011, pp. 75-93.

Digol, Diana, Russia's Foreign Policy in Central Asia: From Yeltsin to Medvedev, in: Maria Raquel Freire/Roger E. Kanet (eds), Russia and Its Near Neighbours, Basingstoke 2012, pp. 174-200.

Dimić, Ljubodrag, Josip Broz Tito, Yugoslav Policy and the Formation of the Concept of European Security 1968 - 1975, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 59-81.

Ditrych, Ondřej/Vít Střítecký, Konfliktregulierung in Georgien. Chance und Verpflichtung für die EU, in: Osteuropa 2/2012, pp. 135-145.

Doutriaux, Yves, Les enjeux pour L'Union européenne de la „zone OSCE", in: Revue du marché commun et de l'Union européenne 6/2012, pp. 375-383.

Drutsas, Dimitrios, To Think Globally and to Act Locally, in: International Affairs (Minneapolis, MN) 5/2011, pp. 6-10.

Eichwede, Wolfgang, "... but it Must be a Détente with a Human Face". Helsinki and the Human Rights Movements in Eastern Europe, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 255-284.

Evers, Frank, OSCE Field Activities: Verbal Encouragement, Factual Cutback, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 339-347.

Fernandes, Sandra, The European Union and the Medvedev Proposal: A Breakthrough or an Empty Shell? In: Roger E. Kanet/Maria Raquel Freire (eds), Russia and European Security, Dordrecht 2012, pp. 261-284.

Fischer, Thomas, Getting to Know Their Limits: The N+N and the Follow-Up Meeting in Belgrade 1977/78, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 163-184.

Gabanyi, Anneli Ute, Der Konflikt in Transnistrien im Kontext der europäischen Sicherheitspolitik, in: Johann Pucher/Johann Frank (eds), Strategie und Sicherheit 2012, Vienna 2012, pp. 357-368.

Greminger, Thomas, Reviewing the OSCE Human Dimension Events, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 349-351.

Griep, Ekkehard, OSZE, in: Ekkehard Griep, Regionale Organisationen und die Weiterentwicklung der VN-Friedenssicherung seit dem Ende des Kalten Krieges, Baden-Baden 2012, pp. 279-300.

Gromyko, Alexei, Security through Cooperation, in: International Affairs [Minneapolis, MN] 5/2011, pp. 20-22.

Hamilton, Daniel, Das große Sowohl-Als-Auch. Die Europapolitik der USA unter Barack Obama, in: Osteuropa 2/2012, pp. 5-26.

Hazewinkel, Harm J., Improving OSCE Human Dimension Events – A Never-Ending Story, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 353-356.

Heintze, Hans-Joachim, The Unique Contribution of the OSCE in the Field of Minority Protection, in: Wolfgang Benedek//Florence Benoît-Rohmer/Wolfram Karl/Manfred Nowak (eds), European Yearbook on Human Rights 2012, Antwerp 2012, pp. 349-361.

Herd, Graeme P., Russia's European Security Treaty and the Kyrgyz Crisis, in: Maria Raquel Freire/Roger E. Kanet (eds), Russia and Its Near Neighbours, Basingstoke 2012, pp. 129-151.

Hildebrand, Klaus, The Cold War as Détente. The Phenomenology of the World Community of Nation States in the 1970s, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 25-37.

Hughes, Robert Gerald, Britain, East-West Détente and the CSCE, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 119-142.

Ibryamova, Nuray, The OSCE as a Regional Security Actor. A Security Governance Perspective, in: Emil J. Kirchner/Roberto Domínguez (eds), The Security Governance of Regional Organizations, London 2011, pp. 79-104.

Jarząbek, Wanda, Lost Illusions? The Polish Government and Human Rights Issues from Helsinki to Belgrade, 1975-1978, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/

Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 305-320.

Kreikemeyer, Anna, Herrschaft statt Sicherheit. Die Organisation des Vertrags für Kollektive Sicherheit, in: Osteuropa 5/2012, pp. 81-91.

Kropatcheva, Elena, Russia and the Role of the OSCE in European Security: a 'Forum' for Dialog or a 'Battlefield' of Interests? In: European Security 3/2012, pp. 370-394.

Kropatcheva, Elena, Russian Foreign Policy in the Realm of European Security through the Lens of Neoclassical Realism, in: Journal of Eurasian Studies 1/2012, pp. 30-40.

Kullaa, Rinna, The Birth and Development of the CSCE: Finnish and Yugoslav Models for Neutrality in the Early Cold War, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 39-58.

Lambert, Sara, The Dutch Fight Alone: The Principle of Self-Determination, in: Security and Human Rights 1/2012, pp. 45-56.

Laumulin, Murat, The European Union is Readjusting Its Central Asian Strategy, in: Central Asia and the Caucasus 4/2011, pp. 30-45.

Lewis, David, Who's Socialising Whom? Regional Organisations and Contested Norms in Central Asia, in: Europe-Asia Studies 7/2012, pp. 1219-1237.

Lomagin, Nikita, Medvedev's European Security Treaty Proposal: Building a Euro-Atlantic Security Community? In: Roger E. Kanet/Maria Raquel Freire (eds), Russia and European Security, Dordrecht 2012, pp. 225-259.

Manutscharjan, Aschot L., Der armenisch-aserbaidschanische Konflikt. Keine Lösung in Sicht, in: Johann Pucher/Johann Frank (eds), Strategie und Sicherheit 2012, Wien 2012, pp. 385-394.

McCausland, Jeffrey D., The Conventional and Nuclear Nexus in Europe, in: Tom Nichols/Douglas Stuart/Jeffrey D. McCausland (eds), Tactical Nuclear Weapons and NATO, Carlisle, PA 2012, pp. 477-503.

Meier, Oliver/Götz Neuneck/Wolfgang Zellner, Vor dem Nato-Gipfel: Dilemmata europäischer Rüstungskontrolle, in: Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik 5/2012, pp. 59-68.

Nowak, Manfred/Karolina Januszewski, Criminal Justice and Prison Standards in the OSCE Area, in: Wolfgang Benedek//Florence Benoît-Rohmer/Wolfram Karl/Manfred Nowak (eds), European Yearbook on Human Rights 2012, Antwerp 2012, pp. 315-348.

Ostlund, Axel/Markus Mueller, People's Security – Today's Challenges of a New Approach to Policing: Working Experience of the Community Security Initiative (CSI) Project in Kyrgyzstan 2011, in: Security and Human Rights 1/2012, pp. 57-63.

Perrin de Brichambaut, Marc, The OSCE in Perspective, Six Years of Service, Six Questions and a few Answers, in: Security and Human Rights 1/2012, pp. 31-44.

Peski, Caecilia J. van, Diplomacy and Life on Georgia's Boundary Line, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 357-371.

Pöllinger, Sigrid, Transatlantische Sicherheitsmodelle am Beispiel der NATO und der OSZE, in: Wiener Blätter zur Friedensforschung 2/2012, pp. 47-60.

Romano, Angela, The European Community and the Belgrade CSCE, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 205-224.

Schatz, Edward/Elena Maltseva, Kazakhstan's Authoritarian Persuasion, in: Post-Soviet Affairs 1/2012, pp. 45-65.

Schmidt, Hans-Joachim/Wolfgang Zellner, Confidence- and Security-Building Measures, in: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (ed.), SIPRI Yearbook 2012, Oxford 2012, pp. 447-452.

Schmidt, Hans-Joachim/Wolfgang Zellner, Limiting Conventional Arms to Promote Military Security: The Case of Conventional Arms Control in Europe, in: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (ed.), SIPRI Yearbook 2012, Oxford 2012, pp. 442-446.

Scholtyseck, Joachim, GDR Dissidents and Human Rights Issues, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 285-304.

Seifert, Arne C., Afghanistans Schatten. Die Sorgen der Nachbarn und die Rolle der OSZE, in: WeltTrends 82/2012, pp. 15-20.

Shelest, Hanna, Institutional Mediation of the Conflicts in the Caucasus, in: Central Asia and the Caucasus 2/2012, pp. 37-44.

Simonet, Loïc, Vingt ans après la signature du traité Ciel ouvert, dix ans après son entrée en vigueur: Succès et incertitudes d'un régime emblématique de l'après-Guerre froide, in: Sécurité globale 18/2011/12, pp. 119-130.

Skovgaard, Jakob, Power beyond Conditionality: European Organisations and the Hungarian Minorities in Romania and Slovakia, in: Journal of International Relations and Development 4/2011, pp. 440-468.

Smith, Hanna, Domestic Influences on Russian Foreign Policy: Status, Interests and Ressentiment, in: Maria Raquel Freire/Roger E. Kanet (eds), Russia and Its Near Neighbours, Basingstoke 2012, pp. 39-62.

Sorge, Petra, Media in Kosovo – Long Walk to Modernity, in: Südosteuropa-Mitteilungen 4/2012, pp. 32-47.

Spitzer, Hartwig, Open Skies in Turbulence, a well Functioning Treaty is Endangered by Outside Developments, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 373-382.

Walker, Breck, "Neither Shy nor Demagogic" – The Carter Administration Goes to Belgrade, in: Vladimir Bilandžić/Dittmar Dahlmann/Milan

Kosanović (eds), From Helsinki to Belgrade, Göttingen 2012, pp. 185-204.

Weixelbaumer, Birgit Angela/Maria Hadjipavlou/Kalliope Agapiou-Josephides, The EU Facing the Human Trafficking Challenge: Reintegration as a Possible Shift Towards a Victim-Centred Approach, in: Wolfgang Benedek//Florence Benoît-Rohmer/Wolfram Karl/Manfred Nowak (eds), European Yearbook on Human Rights 2012, Antwerp 2012, pp. 185-196.

Wohlfeld, Monika, The OSCE Contribution to Democratization in North African Countries, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 383-397.

Wohlfeld, Monika, The OSCE's Mediterranean Dialogue: Can it Contribute to Democratization in North African Countries? In: Stephen Calleya/Monika Wohlfeld (eds), Change and Opportunities in the Emerging Mediterranean, Msida 2012, pp. 470-494.

Yelchenko, Volodymyr, Developing Strategic Partnership Based on Equality and Pragmatism (Interview), in: Security Index 4/2011, pp. 9-13.

Zagorski, Andrei, Tactical Nuclear Weapons, in: Security and Human Rights 4/2011, pp. 399-409.

Zagorskij, Andrej, Auf verlorenem Posten? Die Zukunft der OSZE im europäischen Sicherheitssystem, in: Osteuropa 2/2012, pp. 117-133.

Zellner, Wolfgang, Back to Reality: The 2011 Vilnius Ministerial Council Meeting, in: Security and Human Rights 1/2012, pp. 7-9.

Zellner, Wolfgang, Conventional Arms Control in Europe: Is There a Last Chance? In: Arms Control Today 2/2012, pp. 14-19.

Zellner, Wolfgang, Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa (OSZE), in: Jan Bergmann (ed.), Handlexikon der Europäischen Union, Baden-Baden 2012, pp. 713-716.

Abbreviations

ACFE	Adapted Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
ACMF	Advisory Committee on Management and Finance
AEI	Alliance for European Integration
ANSF	Afghan National Security Forces
AIAM	Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASRC	Annual Security Review Conference
ASSR	Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic
ATU	Action against Terrorism Unit
AU	African Union
BfV	Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz/Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution
BiH	Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina
BKA	Bundeskriminalamt/Federal Criminal Police Office
BMSC	Border Management Staff College
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa
BSEC	Black Sea Economic Cooperation
CACO	Central Asian Cooperation Organization
CALO	Central Asia Liaison Office
CBMs	Confidence-Building Measures
CBSS	Council of the Baltic Sea States
CCIIR	Centre for Civil Integration and Inter-Ethnic Relations
CDC	Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations
CEC	Central Election Commission
CEEA	Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
CEFTA	Central European Free Trade Agreement
CEI	Central European Initiative
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
CERD	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
CFE Treaty	Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CICA	Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia
CiO	Chairperson-in-Office
CIPDD	Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CMEA	Council for Mutual Economic Assistance
CNPC	China National Petroleum Corporation
CoE	Council of Europe
COMISAF	Commander of the International Security Assistance Force

473

CORE	Centre for OSCE Research
CPC	Conflict Prevention Centre
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
CSBMs	Confidence- and Security-Building Measures
CSCE	Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (since January 1995 OSCE)
CSO	Committee of Senior Officials
CSTC-A	Combined Security Transition Command – Afghanistan
CSTO	Collective Security Treaty Organization
DCAF	Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council
EASI	Euro-Atlantic Security Initiative
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EC	European Commission
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECMI	European Centre for Minority Issues
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ECRI	European Commission against Racism and Intolerance
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EdRo	Yedinaya Rossiya/United Russia
EEAS	European External Action Service
EED	Economic and Environmental Dimension
EEF	Economic and Environmental Forum
EG TEX	Ermittlergruppe Terrorismus/Extremismus; Investigation Group Terrorism/Extremism
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ENVSEC	Environment and Security Initiative
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUA	European University Association
EUFOR	European Union Force
EULEX	European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo
EUMM	European Monitoring Mission
EUPM	European Union Police Mission
EUSR	European Union Special Representative
FCNM	Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities
FDPs	Formerly Deported Persons
Fidesz-MPSZ	Fiatal Demokraták Szövetsége – Magyar Polgári Szövetség/Alliance of Young Democrats – Hungarian Civic Union
FRS	Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique/Foundation for Strategic Studies

FSB	Federalnaya Sluzhba Bezopasnosti Rossiiskoi Federatsii/ Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation
FSC	Forum for Security Co-operation
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
G3	China, the United States, and the European Union
G8	Group of Eight
G20	Group of Twenty
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GNI	Gross National Income
GNP	Gross National Product
GUAM	Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldova
GYLA	Georgian Young Lawyers Association
HCNM	High Commissioner on National Minorities
HDIM	Human Dimension Implementation Meeting
HDS	Human Dimension Seminar
HDZ BiH	Hrvatska demokratska zajednica Bosne i Hercegovine/Cro- atian Democratic Union of Bosnia and Herzegovina
HoM	Head of Mission
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
ICG	International Crisis Group
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
IDEAS	Initiative for the Development of a Euro-Atlantic and Eur- asian Security Community
IFOR	Implementation Force
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMEMO	Institute of World Economy and International Relations
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMU	Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPI	International Peace Institute
IPTF	International Police Task Force
IRMA	Integrated Resource Management System
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
IWG	Internal Working Group
Jobbik	Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom/The Movement for a Better Hungary
KazISS	Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies
KFOR	Kosovo Force

KPRF	Kommunisticheskaya Partiya Rossiiskoi Federatsii/ Communist Party of the Russian Federation
LAS	League of Arab States
LDP	Liberalno-Demokratska Partija/Liberal Democratic Party (Serbia)
LDPR	Liberal'no-Demokraticheskaya Partiya Rossii/Liberal Democratic Party of Russia
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
LMP	Lehet Más a Politika/Politics Can Be Different
MAD	Amt für den militärischen Abschirmdienst/Military Counter-intelligence Service
MAP	Membership Action Plan
MC	Ministerial Council
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MEP	Member of the European Parliament
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MGIMO	Moskovsky gosudarstvennyi institut mezhdunarodnykh otnosheny (universitet)/Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University)
MIA	Ministry of Internal Affairs
MLE	Multilingual Education
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Member of Parliament
MPC	Mediterranean Partner for Co-operation
MRA	Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCTC	National Counterterrorism Center
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NPD	Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands/National Democratic Party of Germany
NRC	NATO-Russia Council
NSU	Nationalsozialistischer Untergrund/National Socialist Underground
NTM-A	NATO Training Mission – Afghanistan
OAS	Organization of American States
OCEEA	Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OHR	Office of the High Representative

OIC	Organisation of Islamic Cooperation
OMiK	OSCE Mission in Kosovo
OMON	Otryad Mobilnyi Osobogo Naznacheniya/Special Purpose Mobile Unit
OPCAT	Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
OSI	Open Society Institute
OSR/CTHB	Office of the Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PA	Parliamentary Assembly
PACE	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
PAQ	Project Appraisal Questionnaire
PBPB	Performance-Based Programme Budgeting
PC	Permanent Council
PCU	Project Co-ordination Unit
PfP	Partnership for Peace
PHARE	Poland and Hungary Aid for the Reconstruction of the Economy
PIC	Peace Implementation Council
PISM	Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych/Polish Institute of International Affairs
PLC	Project Life Cycle
PMC	Project Management Cycle
PMD	Project Management Database
POW	Prisoner of War
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
RAF	Rote Armee Fraktion/Red Army Faction
REC	Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe
RECCA V	Fifth Regional Economic Cooperation Conference for Afghanistan
RFOM	Representative on Freedom of the Media
RSFSR	Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic
SAA	Stabilisation and Association Agreement
SALW	Small Arms and Light Weapons
SBB BiH	Savez za bolju budućnost Bosne i Hercegovine/Union for a Better Future of Bosnia and Herzegovina
SBiH	Stranka za Bosnu i Hercegovinu/Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organisation
SDA	Stranka Demokratske Akcije/Party of Democratic Action (Bosnia and Herzegovina)

SDP	Socijaldemokratska Partija Bosne i Hercegovine/Social Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina
SDPK	Social Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan
SDS	Srpska Demokratska Stranka/Serbian Democratic Party (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
SEATO	South East Asia Treaty Organization
SECI	Southeast European Cooperative Initiative
SEECP	South-East European Cooperation Process
SEE University/	
SEEU	The South East European University
SFOR	Stabilisation Force
SHDM	Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting
SLfV	Sächsisches Landesamt für Verfassungsschutz/Saxon Office for the Protection of the Constitution
SNSD	Savez Nezavisnih Socijaldemokrata/Alliance of Independent Social Democrats (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
SOAS	School of Oriental and African Studies
SPMU	Strategic Police Matters Unit
SR	Spravedlivaya Rossiya/A Just Russia
SSG	Security Sector Governance
SSR	Security Sector Reform
SSR	Soviet Socialist Republic
START	Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
TANDIS	Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Information System
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TLfV	Thüringer Landesamt für Verfassungsschutz/Thuringian Office for the Protection of the Constitution
TLKA	Thüringer Landeskriminalamt/Thuringian State Criminal Police Office
TNTs	Transnational Threats
TYP	Transition Year Programme
UCLA	University of California, Los Angeles
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UEFA	Union of European Football Associations
UK	United Kingdom
UN/UNO	United Nations/United Nations Organization
UNAMA	United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan
UNCHR	United Nations Commission on Human Rights
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNHCHR/ UNOHCHR	United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights/UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
UNMIBH	United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina
UNMIK	United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo
UNODA	United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
UP	University of Pristina
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
UT	University of Tetovo
VD	Vienna Document
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WEU	Western European Union
WGE	Working Group on Energy
WGMD	Working Group on Missile Defense
WGNSNW	Working Group on Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons
WGRPC	Working Group on Reconciliation and Protracted Conflicts
WGT	Working Group on Turkey
WITS	Worldwide Incidents Tracking System
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WTO	World Trade Organization

Contributors

Dr Alice Ackermann, Senior Operational Adviser, Conflict Prevention Centre/Operations Service (CPC/OS), OSCE Secretariat; Vienna

Dr Olivier A.J. Brenninkmeijer, Associate Dean at the Business School Lausanne; former Chief Academic Officer at CAPA International Education in London; previously, Visiting Professor for the PhD programme at UAMD, Albania, and Research Project Manager at the United Nations in Geneva as well as at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, University of Geneva; Lausanne

Dr Klemens Büscher, 2004-2011 Senior Adviser to the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM); Co-ordinator for Central and Eastern Europe at *Kindermissionswerk "Die Sternsinger"*, the international children's relief organization of the German Catholic Church; Aachen

Dr Manon de Courten, Project Officer at the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM); The Hague

Jennifer Croft, Senior Adviser to the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM); The Hague

Marcin Czapliński, Head of the South-Eastern Europe and EU Enlargement Section, Department of European Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland; from 1999 to 2005 Senior Political Adviser to the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM); Warsaw

Dr Pál Dunay, Director of International Training Course, Geneva Centre for Security Policy; Geneva

Tobias Flessenkemper, Visiting Fellow at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP); 2005-2012 Senior Political Advisor, EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina; Berlin

Eamon Gilmore, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Ireland, Chairperson-in-Office of the OSCE in 2012; Dublin

Prof. Hans-Joachim Heintze, Institute for International Law of Peace and Armed Conflict, Ruhr University; Bochum

Dr Graeme P. Herd, Senior Programme Adviser and Senior Fellow, Leadership in Conflict Management Programme, Geneva Centre for Security Policy; Geneva

Dr Alisher Ilkhamov, Research Associate, Centre of Contemporary Central Asia & the Caucasus, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London; London

Matthias Z. Karádi, Senior Researcher at the German Bundestag; Berlin

Dr Walter Kemp, Director for Europe and Central Asia at the International Peace Institute (IPI); he worked for more than ten years for the OSCE, among other things as an adviser to a number of Chairmanships, including Lithuania in 2011; Vienna

Dr Elena Kropatcheva, Researcher at the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE)/Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH); Hamburg

Juliane Markard-Narten, *M.A. Organizational Management*, former staff member of the OSCE Mission in Kosovo and the OSCE Office in Baku; Dili

Dr Rolf Mützenich, Foreign Policy Spokesman of the Parliamentary Social Democratic Party; Berlin

Dr Jens Narten, Research Fellow at the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE)/Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH), former staff member of the OSCE Mission in Kosovo; Dili

Dmitry Nurumov, Legal Adviser to the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM); The Hague

Rytis Paulauskas, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Lithuania to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva; 2003-2008 Lithuania's Permanent Representative to the OSCE; until the end of 2011, Head of the Lithuania OSCE Chairmanship Task Force; Geneva

Elisa Perry, Program Manager, Euro-Atlantic Security Initiative; Washington, DC

Dr Natalie Sabanadze, Senior Political Adviser to the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM); The Hague

Ursel Schlichting, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH); Hamburg

Dr Loïc Simonet, Politico-Military Counsellor of the Permanent Representation of France to the OSCE, Vienna

Dr Sven C. Singhofen, Lecturer at the Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science, University of Kiel; Kiel

Azamat Temirkulov, Assistant Professor at the American University in Central Asia, Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan), visiting researcher at the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE)/Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH) and PhD candidate at the University of Hamburg; Bishkek/Hamburg

Knut Vollebæk, OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Norway; The Hague

Prof. Rosemarie Will, holder of the Chair of Public Law, Political Theory and Jurisprudence at the Humboldt University of Berlin; Berlin

Lamberto Zannier, Ambassador, Secretary General of the OSCE; Vienna

Dr Wolfgang Zellner, Deputy Director of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH) and Head of the IFSH's Centre for OSCE Research (CORE); Hamburg