

**CIVIL DIMENSION  
OF SECURITY**

137 CDS 06 E rev 1  
Original: English



**NATO Parliamentary Assembly**

**SUMMARY**

of the meeting of the Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security  
*Paris Hall, Palais des Congrès, Paris, France*

Sunday 28 May 2006

**ATTENDANCE LIST**

<b>Chairman</b>	Michael Clapham (United Kingdom)
<b>Vice-Chairman</b>	Lucio Malan (Italy)
<b>Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Democratic Governance</b>	Tchetin Kazak (Bulgaria)
<b>General Rapporteur</b>	Vitalino Canas (Portugal)
<b>Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Democratic Governance</b>	Bert Middel (Netherlands)
<b>Special Rapporteur</b>	Lord Jopling (United Kingdom)
<b>President of the NATO PA</b>	Pierre Lellouche (France)
<b>Secretary General</b>	Simon Lunn
<b>Member Delegations</b>	
Belgium	Mia De Schamphelaere
	Philippe Mahoux
Canada	Jane Cordy
Czech Republic	Vitezslav Vavrousek
France	Paulette Brisepierre
Germany	Jürgen Herrmann
	Hellmut Königshaus
	Ursula Mogg
	Harald Schliemann
	Ralf Stegner
	Jörn Thiessen
Greece	Sofia Kalantzakou
Latvia	Dzintars Rasnacs
Lithuania	Alvydas Sadeckas
Luxembourg	Marc Angel
Netherlands	Bart van Winsen
Norway	Hans Olav Syversen
Poland	Rafal Slusarz
	Jacek Wlosowicz
Romania	Mihail Lupoi
Slovenia	Franc Kangler
Spain	Hilario Caballero
Turkey	Zuheyir Amber
	Emin Bilgiç
	Ahmet Faruk Ünsal
United Kingdom	Frank Cook
	Bruce George
	Jimmy Hood
	Ann McKechin
	John Stanley
United States	Ben Chandler
	Jo Ann Emerson
	Dennis Moore
	John Tanner

Tom Udall

**Associate Delegations**

Austria

Katharina Pfeffer

Detlev Neudeck

Azerbaijan

Tahir Suleymanov

Croatia

Kresimir Cosic

Marin Jurjevic

Georgia

Velimir Plesa

Irakli Kavtaradze

Moldova

Nicholas Rurua

Vitalia Pavlicenco

Russian Federation

Iurue Rosca

Valery Bogomolov

Mikhail Kapura

Yuliy Kvitsinskiy

Vladimir Zhirinovskiy

Andrey Zhukov

Sweden

Tone Tingsgard

Switzerland

Barbara Haering

the FYR of Macedonia\*

Slobodan Casule

Ukraine

Valeriy Kelestyn

**Mediterranean Associate Delegations**

Algeria

Messaoud Chihoub

Abdelhamid Latreche

Mohamed Mebarki

Israel

Gideon Saar

Jordan

Reyad Abu Karaki

Hakem Al-Kadi

**European Parliament**

Ana Maria R.M Gomes

Teresa Riera Madurell

**Parliamentary Observers**

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Halid Genjac

Japan

Masataka Suzuki

Kazakhstan

Rashit Akhmetov

**Parliamentary Guest**

Assembly of Kosovo

Oliver Ivanovic

Hajredin Kuçi

**NATO**

Carsten Fausboll

---

\* Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name

**Speakers**

Ambassador Lubomir Ivanov, Permanent  
Representative of Bulgaria to NATO  
Ovidiu Dranga, Director General of Political  
Affairs, Romanian Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs  
Jean-Louis Bruguière, First Vice-President of  
the *Tribunal de Grande Instance de Paris*

**International Secretariat**

Ruxandra Popa, Director  
Claire Watkins, Co-ordinator  
Olga Stuzhinskaya, Research Assistant  
Anna Macdonald, Research Assistant

## I. Opening Remarks

1. The Chairman, **Michael Clapham** (UK) introduced the draft agenda of the meeting. **The draft agenda and the summary of the meeting of the Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security held in Copenhagen were adopted without comments.**

## II. Panel discussion on *Bulgaria and Romania's Perspectives on the Black Sea Region* with **Ambassador Lubomir Ivanov, Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to NATO, and Ovidiu Dranga, Director General for Political Affairs, Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

2. In his presentation, **Ambassador Ivanov** underlined the strategic importance of the Black Sea region for NATO and the European Union and called upon Euro-Atlantic organizations to step up their involvement in the region, based on a common vision and a coordinated approach. Euro-Atlantic partners and organisations still needed to develop a comprehensive and multifaceted approach to the region. Mr Ivanov identified three 3 areas in particular, where the international community could become more involved and support regional initiatives: encouraging reform processes in the region; assisting in resolving the so-called frozen conflicts; assisting in fighting illegal trafficking and organised crime.

3. **Ovidiu Dranga** also emphasized the dynamics currently reshaping the Black Sea region and the new opportunities they created, particularly in terms of democratic transformation and economic development. Like Ambassador Ivanov, he pleaded for coherence and synergy between the various initiatives in the region and underlined the role that Romania was hoping to play as a catalyst for regional co-operation and Euro-Atlantic engagement. The Black Sea Forum to be held in Bucharest in June ambitions to provide a model for a new approach to the region.

4. The Chairman asked whether current organizations and initiatives in the region were robust enough to tackle existing problems. Mr Dranga replied that new ideas, more transparency and less bureaucracy were needed for regional organizations to function effectively. Adjusting current tools to today's realities was crucial because the situation in the region had drastically changed since the 1990s. Mr Ivanov added that making regional organizations robust enough would also require connecting them with the main international players — NATO and the EU. Both organizations had for now proved cautious and shied away from approaching the Black Sea area as one region.

5. **Vitalino Canas** (PT) asked what impact the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union would have on the challenges faced by the region. He also enquired about the opportunity of creating a single framework to bring together under one roof all current initiatives. Both speakers agreed that it would be better to have one initiative, but emphasized that this depended also on where the Black Sea region would stand on the European Union and NATO's agenda. On the accession question, Mr Ivanov stressed that, for Bulgaria and Romania, joining the European Union meant meeting certain requirements for the protection of the external borders of the Union. However, he pleaded for a consolidated approach, whereby NATO and the European Union support individual states in their efforts to tackle such problems as trafficking.

6. In response to a question by **Ana Maria Gomes** (European Parliament) regarding Romania and Bulgaria's progress in children protection, both speakers agreed that this problem remained one of the priorities for both countries. Greater co-operation with the international community was needed for better results.

7. **Bruce George** (UK) raised the issue of Georgia and asked whether the governments of Romania and Bulgaria supported Georgia in its ambition to move to the next stage in its relations

with NATO. Mr Ivanov and Mr Dranga agreed that Georgia made tremendous progress and deserved to be granted an intensified dialogue with NATO. Both countries and their governments directly supported Georgia's efforts.

8. Responding to a question from **Teresa Riera Madurell** (European Parliament) about energy issues in the Black Sea, Mr Dranga underlined the importance of a unified European voice on the energy issue and the need to promote alternative energy sources. Ambassador Ivanov, in turn, stressed the importance of defining the role of NATO in the area of energy security. Diversification and the absence of monopoly were key elements in addressing this issue.

### **III. Consideration of the draft Report of the Sub-Committee on Democratic Governance, Frameworks and Areas of Co-operation in the Black Sea Region [059 CDS DG 06 E], by Bert Middel (NL), Rapporteur**

9. **The Rapporteur** reminded members that the Black Sea region has recently become the focus of renewed attention, as the countries of the region got closer to Euro-Atlantic institutions. However, generally speaking, NATO, as the European Union, has not considered regional frameworks as a primary tool for its relations with countries in the region but preferred to deal with them individually. Co-operation in the region is developing with new focus areas, such as democratisation, security and energy. The unresolved conflicts in Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Nagorno-Karabakh and Transdniestria remain major obstacles for regional co-operation and further Euro-Atlantic integration.

10. In response to a question by the Chairman on the role of Turkey in the region, the Rapporteur responded that the report underlined the active contribution of Turkey to co-operation in the Black Sea region. Reacting to this comment, **Ahmet Faruk Ünsal** (TR) requested some changes in the text regarding Turkey's interest and policy in the Black Sea. In particular, he stressed that Turkey does not aspire to a leading role in the Black Sea region. He also reminded Turkey's efforts to integrate Armenia in regional co-operation frameworks. The Rapporteur took note of the comments and admitted that Turkey's role, which has deep historical roots, should be better analyzed in the report. He also acknowledged progress in Turkish-Armenian relations, although a lot still remained to be done to bring the two countries closer.

11. **Andrey Zhukov** (RU) cautioned against an excessively broad definition of the region. Moreover, regional co-operation should focus on concrete economic projects rather than on the creation of political forums. Mr Zhukov also called upon the Rapporteur to pay more attention to the current role of Russia in the region, particularly since Russia had recently taken the chairmanship of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation Organisation. Finally, Mr Zhukov added that his country was open to suggestions and concrete steps offered by other partners.

### **IV. Presentation by Frank Cook (UK) on the findings of his visit to Bosnia and Herzegovina**

12. **Frank Cook** (UK) reported to the members the findings of his recent visit to the Hodova settlement for Internally Displaced Persons in the predominantly Croat district of Stolac. He described the poverty and state of dereliction of this settlement, which has benefited from virtually no assistance from local authorities and enjoys no long-term perspective of resettlement. He noted indications of an enduring, if not growing, ethnic and religious activism among the local population, which tends to perpetuate tensions between communities. International assistance was now running out and existing projects are regularly hampered by sectarian rivalries or the heavy BiH bureaucracy. According to Mr Cook, the problems faced by the Hodova community illustrate some of the challenges still facing BiH, as it strives to build a multi-ethnic state. He urged members of

the Committee to take these into account when adopting the General Report on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**V. Consideration of the draft General Report *Bosnia and Herzegovina: Prospects for the Post-Dayton Era* [058 CDS 06 E], by Vitalino Canas (PT), General Rapporteur**

13. Mr Canas presented the main elements of the draft report and the findings of the Committee's visit to The Hague and Sarajevo in February-March 2006. He commended Bosnia and Herzegovina's achievements since Dayton but also noted the challenges that remain, particularly in the areas of political and socio-economic transition; security and defence; and co-operation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. He insisted that Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) still needed the continued engagement of the international community, but emphasized that it was up to the Bosnian authorities and the Bosnian people to move their country into the post-Dayton era.

14. The Chairman pointed out that the Committee is aware of recent developments in BiH, in particular the way in which the Republika Sprska was trying to unpick agreements on police reforms. He stressed that the European Union should be robust in the way that it uses the Stabilisation Association Agreement (SAA) as a lever after the elections in October 2006 to demonstrate how serious the international community is about reform in BiH.

15. **Jo Ann Emerson** (US) expressed some concern about the failure of the BiH parliament to approve constitutional reform on April 26 of this year. She pointed out that the October elections could create political stalemate and thus stall the reform process and asked specifically how the elections may impact on the timeline for progress. Mr Canas agreed that the failure to approve the Constitution was a bad sign and expressed his concern that nationalism may play a major role in the October elections. He expressed hope that the elections are democratic and that, with the help of the international community, the Bosnian people are able to continue on their present path.

16. Emphasizing the role of regional co-operation in the Balkans, **Kresimir Cosic** (HR) stressed that economic reconstruction should be 'objective number one' for the region. Without strengthening the economy, regional stability and security would remain weak. Mr Cosic argued that a Regional Free Trade Agreement with the support of the EU was vital, as was co-operation to combat organized crime in order to eliminate the parallel economy which provides a source of income for so many.

17. **Halid Genjac** (BA) said that he thought the report was excellent but wished to provide the Committee with some additional information. He stated that defence and security sector reform in BiH was a major success for NATO and emphasized that admitting BiH into the Partnership for Peace programme would provide a strong incentive for moving forward. He noted that public opinion in BiH was strongly in favour of European integration. Referring to the failure of the Bosnian government to approve the constitutional amendments, he stated that additional requirements should not be made for BiH to successfully integrate into the Euro-Atlantic area. Finally, Mr Genjac agreed with Mr Cosic that the most problematic area remains the economy. He emphasized the shortage of investment in BiH and called upon parliamentarians to lobby the appropriate circles in their respective countries to provide investment for infrastructure in BiH.

18. **Zuheyr Amber** (TR) welcomed the progress that BiH has made in the last ten years but regretted that the Bosnian people, by rejecting the constitutional amendments, had missed a good opportunity before the elections. He also stated that full co-operation with the ICTY remained a major challenge for BiH. Mr Canas concurred but expressed the hope that the constitutional amendments would soon be approved.

19. **Barbara Haering** (CH) raised the issue, mentioned in the report, that some political parties supported transferring the Republika Sprksa into Serbia as compensation for losing Kosovo. Mr Canas replied that this proposal lacked credibility but that the Committee would have to monitor developments.

20. Mr Zhukov asked whether the Rapporteur would be in favour of extending the mandate of the ICTY from 2008 to 2010. Mr Canas answered that the Committee had heard, during their visit to the ICTY, that the Tribunal would be able to fulfil their mandate in the timeframe set by the Completion Strategy.

## **VI. Presentation by Jean-Louis Bruguière, First Vice-President of the *Tribunal de Grande Instance de Paris, on Transatlantic Co-operation in the Fight Against Terrorism***

21. **Judge Bruguière** began his presentation by examining the very concept of the war on terrorism. He stated that a purely military response to terrorism, the method adopted by the United States government, has major political consequences because it pushes terrorism outside of the framework of legality. This has led to the formation of new and ambiguous categories, e.g. 'enemy combatant', and institutions, e.g. the military commissions used in Guantanamo.

22. Judge Bruguière compared the adaptability of different legal systems to the current terrorist threat. He argued that Anglo-Saxon common law systems are inappropriate to deal with this new and unique phenomenon because of strict procedural rules such as those regarding the admissibility of evidence. France, on the other hand, has a system of Roman law, which makes adaptations easier. As a result, it has been able to adapt its legal framework to the terrorist challenge early on. In 1986, it created a National Public Prosecutors Office, which is devoted to the fight against terrorism. Moreover, French law allows prosecutors to target the logistics of terrorist groups, before any attack occurs. Finally, France has created an operational synergy between intelligence, police and judiciary, which is geared towards prevention, and has successfully thwarted several attempted terrorist attacks a year.

23. Responding to a question by **Lucio Malan** (IT) on the consequences of the situation in Iraq, Mr Bruguière replied that Iraq has had a direct and negative effect on terrorism. It has led to the recruitment of new followers and has enhanced the phenomenon of the Martyr. Meanwhile, Iraq has become a 'black hole' in which terrorists can operate freely.

24. In response to a comment by **Tchetin Kazak** (BG) on the differences between the European and the American approach to terrorism, Mr Bruguière argued that although differences remained, there are indications of a shift in thinking in the United States. In particular, there is now an understanding that extra-judicial mechanisms are not sustainable.

25. Answering a question by **Mikhail Kapura** (RU) on the migration-security nexus, Mr Bruguière argued that immigration needs to be tightly regulated in the fight against terrorism. Those countries that make up the Schengen area, for example, need to harmonise their immigration policies.

26. Ms Gomes asked whether there was enough co-operation between European security and police services. Mr Bruguière emphasized that European and transatlantic co-operation in terms of intelligence was excellent and functioned well without any formal institutional framework. Mr George then raised the question of co-operation within individual governments, to which Mr Bruguière replied that, in France, all responsibilities were in the hands of a coordinating task force.



## **VII. Consideration of the draft Special Report on *NATO and Civil Protection* [060 CDS 06 E] by Lord Jopling (UK), Special Rapporteur**

27. In his presentation, **Lord Jopling** (UK) emphasized that despite NATO's increasing role in the area of civil protection, there is still no clear consensus among allies as to what NATO's mandate should be. He stated that geographical expansion and the transformation of the Alliance were the two factors crucial to the pragmatic evolution of NATO's role in civil protection. The report raised the question of what NATO's added value is in this field and how it related to the role of national authorities, which have and should continue to have the primary responsibility in this field.

28. **Abdelhamid Latreche** (DZ) stated that in Algeria civil protection has become a major issue and emphasized the need for complementary and solidarity and a strengthening of the relationship between civilian society and the military. The price of natural disasters in developing countries is excessively high and can impede economic growth. Algeria therefore supports NATO's role in civil protection as part of its transformation process.

29. **Ralf Stegner** (DE) asked whether, in the future, NATO might be defined as an organization for civil protection rather than a military organization. He also asked whether NATO's involvement in civil protection resulted from the nation states' growing inability to deal with natural catastrophes alone or from NATO's need for a new role. Lord Jopling replied that NATO will remain primarily a military alliance. He added that over the centuries these kind of natural catastrophes have been impossible to contain and that as a result, virtually every country in the world would be grateful and glad to know that they have access to planning and logistical support from NATO in these instances.

30. In response to a question by **Ann McKechin** (UK) about NATO's experience in Pakistan, Lord Jopling pointed out the difficulties that NGOs might have in being seen working with military powers.

31. **Carsten Fausboll**, the Head of Civil Emergency Planning at NATO HQ, gave a brief outline of the NATO mission in Pakistan and emphasized that there should be no problem having military forces doing civil-military planning work. Mr Fausboll emphasized that NATO only assists those countries that request assistance and provides assistance primarily to the stricken country, not to the United Nations. With regard to the fight against international terrorism, Mr Fausboll argued that he saw terrorism not only as a threat against nations, but also against territories and specifically against critical infrastructures. As part of its transformation process, NATO should adapt to this threat by paying more attention to the defence of territories and by promoting a holistic approach in which civil and military forces coordinate their efforts better.

## **VIII. Tentative Calendar of the Future Activities of the Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security and of the Sub-Committee on Democratic Governance**

<b>12-16 June 2006</b>	Visit of the Sub-Committee on Democratic Governance (CDS DG) to Armenia and Georgia (joint visit with DSCFC)
<b>20-23 June 2006</b>	Rose-Roth Seminar in Sochi on the South Caucasus
<b>14-15 September 2006</b>	Visit of the Sub-Committee on Democratic Governance (CDS DG) to Ukraine (joint visit with ESCEW)
<b>19-21 October 2006</b>	Rose-Roth Seminar in Moldova

**13-17 November 2006**

52<sup>nd</sup> Annual Session: Quebec, Canada

---