

POLITICAL

259 PC 05 E
Original: English



NATO Parliamentary Assembly

SUMMARY

of the meeting of the Political Committee
Folketingsalen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Saturday 12 and Sunday 13 November 2005

ATTENDANCE LIST

Chairman	Markus Meckel (Germany)
Vice-Chairman	George Voinovich (United States)
General Rapporteur	Bert Koenders (Netherlands)
Chairman of the Sub-Committee on NATO Partnerships	Karl A. Lamers (Germany)
Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on NATO Partnerships	Marco Minniti (Italy)
Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations	Assen Agov (Bulgaria)
Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations	Ruprecht Polenz (Germany)
President of the NATO PA	Pierre Lellouche (France)
Secretary General of the NATO PA	Simon Lunn
Member Delegations	
Belgium	Daniel Bacquelaine Theo Kelchtermans Philippe Mahoux
Bulgaria	Nikolaï Kamov
Canada	Raynell Andreychuk
Denmark	Joseph A. Day Per Kaalund Helge Adam Møller
Estonia	Tiit Matsulevits
France	Loïc Bouvard Michel Lefait Jean Puech Philippe Vitel
Germany	Uwe Karl Beckmeyer Volker Bouffier Klaus-Jürgen Jeziorsky Kurt. Rossmanith Marianne Tritz
Greece	Nikolaos Legkas Vassilios Maghinias Ioannis Papantoniou Antonis Skillakos
Hungary	István Simicskó
Italy	Lamberto Dini Giovanni Lorenzo Forcieri Luigi Marino
Latvia	Guntis Berzins Dzintars Rasnacs
Lithuania	Juozas Olekas

Luxembourg	Colette Flesch
Netherlands	Bart van Winsen
Norway	Marit Nybakk
	Jan Petersen
Poland	Marian Pilka
Portugal	Rui Gomes Da Silva
	José Lello
	Renato Sampaio
Romania	Norica Nicolai
	Mihai Stanisoara
	Ioan Talpes
Slovakia	Jozef Banás
Slovenia	Branko Grims
Spain	Rafael Estrella
	Josep Maldonado
Turkey	Inal Batu
United Kingdom	Bruce George
	Paul Keetch
	Baroness Ramsay of Cartvale
	Peter Viggers
United States	Jim Bunning
	Ben Chandler
	Jo Ann Emerson
	Trent Lott
	Mike Ross
	Gordon Smith
	Tom Tancredo
	John Tanner
	Tom Udall

Associate delegations

Albania	Leonard Demi
Armenia	Aleksan Karapetyan
Austria	Walter Murauer
Croatia	Marin Jurjevic
	Velimir Plesa
Finland	Suvi-Anne Siimes
	Kauko Juhantalo
Moldova	Vitalia Pavlicenoc
	Iurie Rosca
Russian Federation	Victor Ozerov
	Dmiry Sablin
Switzerland	Hermann Bürgi
	Barbara Haering
the FYR of Macedonia*	Slobodan Casule
	Esad Rahic
Ukraine	Sergey Bychkov
	Oleg Zarubinskyi

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

Mediterranean Associate delegation

Algeria

Ahmed Issad
Abdelhamid Latreche**European Parliament**Paulo Casaca
Ana Maria Gomes
Pawel Piskorski
Teresa Riera Madurell
Karl von Wogau**Parliamentary Observers**Bosnia and Herzegovina
JapanHalid Genjac
Shintaro Ito
Asahiko Mihara
Masataka Suzuki
Hasan Kreishi
Zvonko Obradovic
Aleksandar PravdicPalestinian Legislative Council
Serbia and Montenegro**Interparliamentary assemblies**

Assembly of the Western European Union

Pedro Agramunt Font de Mora

OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Paul Legendre

SpeakersH.E. Mr Kai Eide, former Special Envoy of the UN
Secretary General to Kosovo and Permanent
Representative of Norway to NATOMike Haltzel, Senior Foreign Policy Advisor and
Principal of DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary LLPStephen Stedman, Professor of Political Science,
Senior Fellow at the Center for International
Security and Co-operation (CISAC) and Freeman
Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI),
Stanford UniversityPeter Viggo Jakobsen, Head of the Department of
Conflict and Security Studies, Danish Institute for
International Studies**Committee Secretary**

Richard Cooke

International SecretariatSteffen Sachs, Director
Isabelle Arcis, Co-ordinator
Claudia Buerkin, Research Assistant
Olga Stuzhinskaya, Research Assistant

I. **SPEAKERS**

A. **Presentation of Ambassador Kai Eide on Kosovo**

1. **Ambassador Kai Eide**, former Special Envoy of the UN Secretary General to Kosovo and Permanent Representative of Norway to NATO, acknowledged that the future status of the province is a “highly sensitive political issue” as the views of Kosovo Albanians and Serbs remain diametrically opposed and the chance for reconciliation on the ground is very slim. While progress in institution building, i.e. the establishment of executive, legislative and judicial branches, has been made, the international community has started from a “constitutional vacuum”, he acknowledged. The speaker cautioned that the development of new institutions is being undermined by politicians who see themselves as accountable to their parties rather than to the public. In this context, the speaker described the creation of the Kosovo police as a “success”, but added that the justice system is very weak. As organised crime and corruption are the biggest threats to the stability of Kosovo the continued presence of international police is a necessity. Overall, the Ambassador described the general security situation in Kosovo as stable, but fragile.

2. With regard to the province’s economic situation, Mr Eide stressed the progress made, for example in the area of privatisation. Nonetheless, there were “tens of thousands of unresolved property issues” and respect for property was not very high. Moreover, unemployment remained high and poverty widespread, he added. The return of refugees remained an important topic that requires international support and attention over a long period of time. The Ambassador also considered it important that the international community pushed an ambitious decentralisation plan for Kosovo. There was “never a good time to address the question of the province’s future status”, but now was the time to choose between moving forward or sliding backwards. Mr Eide was optimistic that “everybody will benefit from removing the status quo”. Mr Eide indicated the need to move forward with caution, and without setting any artificial deadlines

3. In the debate following the Ambassador’s presentation, **Vitalia Pavlicenoc** (MD) and **Slobodan Casule** (the FYR of Macedonia) asked about the likely impact of Kosovo’s future status on the separatist movements in the area of the former Soviet Union and in the Balkans. Stressing that Kosovo is vitally important to Macedonia, the latter urged the international community to devise a policy of regional integration. He also raised the question of what should follow the decision on Kosovo’s future status. **George Voinovich** (US) asked Mr Eide to comment on Serbia and Montenegro and the EU’s role for stability in the region. In this context, he suggested that the EU could serve as “glue” for bringing the region together. Acknowledging the importance of the EU, Ambassador Eide said that it is important to achieve the “total integration of the Balkans into European structures” in the long term. Meanwhile, there is a need for “stronger EU presence on the ground”, he said. NATO, including the United States, also has an important leadership role in the province: KFOR needed a visible United States presence, he added. With regard to Serbia and Montenegro, the Norwegian NATO envoy noted that the international community should provide more support for democratic forces in Belgrade. Therefore, Western officials should spend more time in Belgrade and to assist democratic leaders there.

4. Commending on Mr Eide’s report, **Victor Ozerov** (RU) reminded participants that Russia has always supported a peaceful solution to the Kosovo issue. He suggested a careful approach in tackling Kosovo’s future to avoid an outcome, which could be similar to the situation in Abkhazia. **Peter Viggers** (UK) asked what more the international community could do to assist the establishment of the rule of law, while **Rafael Estrella** (ES) inquired about the protection of minorities in the province and **Bert Koenders** (NL) about the discussion between the government and opposition in Kosovo. Moreover, he and **Markus Meckel** (DE), the Chairman of the Committee, asked if closer relations between Belgrade and both the EU and NATO would necessarily require the arrests of Karadjic and Mladic. **Zvonko Obradovic** (YU) reminded the

audience that any solution to the Kosovo issue must be the result of compromise. **Karl von Wogau** (European Parliament) commented that the EU needs a consolidation phase after the last enlargement and asked if the EU should take over additional responsibility in Kosovo in the security field as it has done with EUFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina? **Leonard Demi** (AL) stressed the importance of the economy and asked whether the economic aid to the region should not be increased.

5. In his response, the Norwegian envoy underlined the importance of a sufficient police presence in Kosovo. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the EU demonstrated its ability to do the job. Establishing and implementing the rule of law in Kosovo was crucial and reducing the number of international judges and prosecutors would be a mistake, Mr Eide emphasised. He added by saying that NATO and the EU should continue their presence and a more active role of the EU would be very positive. Referring to the financial aid question, he noted that it is not only about investment; it is also about the ways of how to facilitate the investment.

B. Presentation by Mike Haltzel on *Challenges to Transatlantic Co-operation and Discussion*

6. **Mike Haltzel**, submitted that the foreign policy adopted by President Bush and individual European countries has led to a deterioration in transatlantic relations. Despite the differences, a community of values still exists between NATO-Europe and the United States. But changing public attitudes are eroding the foundation upon which transatlantic co-operation is based. In this context, he referred to the findings of "Transatlantic Trends 2005", a poll conducted for the German Marshall Fund, and others. The speaker concluded that Europe and the United States differ on a number of security issues. Mr Haltzel believes the only way to successfully meet major security challenges is through co-operation between the United States and Europe.

7. A lively discussion followed the introductory remarks. **Kauko Juhantalo** (FI) asked about promoting the political dialogue between NATO and the EU. **Lamberto Dini** (IT) expressed doubt that the United States could lead the world by itself. He stressed that it is "consensus that makes right what is strong, but without consensus, what is strong does not become right". In this context he said that military actions should not be undertaken without a prior mandate of the UN Security Council. Mr Dini concluded his remarks by commenting that there was full consultation among allies at NATO during the Clinton administration. Mr Meckel inquired about the possible impact of the newly created European Defence Agency (EDA).

8. Regarding the promotion of NATO-EU dialogue, Mr Haltzel cautioned against creating additional institutions. He agreed with the notion that international legitimacy is "tremendously important" for international security. The United States will welcome ESDP if it serves as a mobilising vehicle for increasing military capabilities, the speaker noted, but added that the United States will continue to regard NATO as its tie to Europe. Therefore, anything that weakens NATO is bad both for Europe and for the United States, he stressed.

9. **Suvi-Anne Siimes** (FI) emphasised that today's security is more complex and also includes other threats, including environmental ones. In her view, the United States should be ready to discuss other aspects apart from terrorism, it is looking for more support from Europe. More generally, even though the EU and the United States often speak the same language, they do not always mean the same thing, she said. In a similar vein, **Philippe Mahoux** (BE) said it is legitimate to have different views on security, for example on the Ottawa landmine convention. He, too, emphasised the need for transatlantic consensus, but stressed the right of the EU to develop its specific policies.

10. The speaker agreed on the need for a close and comprehensive co-operation on security, including the environment, but also issues such as a possible avian influenza epidemic. Commenting on the Kyoto protocol and the Ottawa landmine agreement, Mr Haltzel reminded the

Committee that the issues are more complex and that it is not only the United States that is to blame for disagreements, but also the EU.

11. **Jan Petersen** (NO) was less critical of the Bush Administration's foreign policy towards its Allies. **Jozef Banás** (SK) raised the question of costs and their relation to effectiveness of the operations. Discussing the latter, Mr Haltzel emphasised the need to improve intelligence capabilities and mentioned the recent attacks in Jordan as an example of a case where better pre-emptive measures could have been used.

C. Presentation on *UN Reform* by Stephen Stedman and Discussion

12. **Stephen Stedman**'s assessment of UN reform was overall positive with the exception of the non-proliferation debate and the unresolved issue of Security Council reform. He emphasised that the reform agenda was more a transformation than a reform agenda. This is very ambitious in a time when UN member countries are deeply divided over most security issues.

13. According to Mr Stedman, the most important progress has been made in the area of international peace and security, where for the first time the full membership agreed on the "responsibility to protect" as outlined by the Canadian draft paper four years ago. As a result, national sovereignty is no longer sacrosanct, but it requires the government of any country to protect its citizens. Thus, the UN Secretary General has an increased capacity to mediate in civil wars. Moreover, agreement on the establishment of a Peace Building Commission, a Peace Building Support Office and a Peace Building Trust Fund provide means to prevent countries from falling back into civil war after a conflict. Moreover, countries have, for the first time, unconditionally condemned terrorism, but they have merely agreed to debate the Secretary General's proposed strategy for counter-terrorism, which consists of dissuasion, denying financing, deterring states from supporting terrorism, developing state capacity and defending human rights.

14. Concluding his presentation, the two biggest shortcomings of the UN Summit earlier this year were the postponement of UN Security Council reform and the failure to address the issue of non-proliferation, the speaker acknowledged. This showed that a lot of governments are presently in denial about the actual state of the non-proliferation regime.

15. In the debate that followed, **Ana Maria Gomes** (European Parliament) criticised the United States for "disrespecting international law". Mr Koenders held a more critical view of the outcome of the UN Summit in September and reiterated that the responsibility to protect called for increased NATO-UN co-operation. In the area of terrorism, the NATO PA should make an effort to see how the countries that opposed the agenda on non-proliferation (Egypt, Iran, United States) view the NPT. Jan Petersen (NO) called upon the Assembly to submit ideas on how the UN reform agenda could be supported. **Bart van Winsen** (NL) argued that he preferred the Security Council reform to fail if that meant the extension of veto rights. **Shintaro Ito** (JP) stressed that UN reform was not possible without an urgently needed Security Council reform. **Antonis Skillakos** (GR) made additional comments.

16. In his reply to the comments, Mr Stedman stressed that reform of the UN Security Council would not be possible until states stopped reproducing maximalist propositions. He welcomed the "seven-nation nuclear-non-proliferation initiative" spearheaded by Norwegian Foreign Minister Petersen. Concluding his remarks, the speaker argued that most nuclear weapons states are "not serious about nuclear disarmament" and suggested that NATO puts this issue higher on its agenda.

D. Presentation by Peter Viggo Jakobsen on *UN Peacekeeping Operations and Lessons for NATO/UN Co-operation – A Danish Perspective* and Discussion

17. The essence of **Mr Jacobsen's** speech to the Committee was that NATO needed to go beyond war fighting and self-defence in order to be viable in the future. To that end, the Alliance should give priority to co-operation with the UN rather than with the EU. Because they are complementary, NATO and the UN are "perfect partners", he argued: The UN needs rapid reaction combat capable forces and critical enablers in logistics and intelligence, which NATO can provide. NATO needs legitimacy, local knowledge and civilian expertise that can be provided by the UN. In contrast, he considered NATO-EU relations more competitive rather than complementary. The EU wants its own role, and a fight over missions, funds and capabilities seem inevitable. Therefore, NATO-UN institutional co-operation should be enhanced, e.g. through UN liaison officers in Brussels or joint training of desk officers.

18. In the discussion, Mr Van Winsen commented that the speaker may underestimate NATO's adaptations after the Cold War. **Marit Nybakk** (NO) inquired about how UN stabilisation forces could co-operate with regional organisations such as NATO or the EU. Ms Gomes criticised the sale of arms by Alliance member countries to developing countries and suggested that NATO may monitor these. Mr Estrella touched upon the issue of UN Security Council (UNSC) authorisation for military operations and reminded the speaker and the Committee that the 1999 Kosovo air campaign, which did not have UNSC authorisation, was the exception. He asked whether the UN is merely providing the mandate for operations carried out by others.

19. Responding to the comments, Mr Jakobsen said he recognised NATO's adaptations, but found them insufficient. Alluding to media recognition, he said that NATO was losing out to the EU, which will, in his view, "over time steal publicity from NATO". Providing assistance in defence reform would not produce headlines, but "doing operations" would, he maintained. He concluded his presentation by providing three reasons why NATO could and should co-operate more closely with the UN in peace enforcement: the UN's current 70,000 peacekeepers are already overstretched, primarily because the "First World" is unwilling to provide troops; secondly, because the UN will not obtain a peace enforcement capability of its own; and thirdly, because "there will be 'no European army' in the foreseeable future".

II. GENERAL DEBATE

20. In his introductory remarks for the general debate, the Chairman highlighted five topics, namely: NATO co-operation with Ukraine, NATO relations with the Southern Caucasus, the EU and the arms embargo against China, an evaluation of NATO's institutional capabilities for nation building and NATO PA President Pierre Lellouche's proposition of a high level panel on the future of NATO.

21. Referring to the recent visit of the Sub-Committee on NATO Partnerships, Mr Van Winsen said he considered Bosnia and Herzegovina fit to join NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme. He asked the Assembly to consider which steps would be necessary to support Bosnia's entry into the PfP. Mr Casule stressed the need to "have the South-Eastern Europe present in NATO rather than having NATO present in the region". He warned against imposing Kosovo's future status without the rule of law. The Slovenian Ambassador to NATO, **Mr Cinkovic** called for better NATO-EU co-operation in the Balkans. His colleague from Sweden, Ambassador **Per Anderman**, emphasised the importance of partnerships for non-aligned countries such as Sweden and for NATO. He said that the re-organisation of NATO should not diminish the participation of NATO partners and underlined that NATO's communication and dialogue should be improved.

22. Mr Estrella reflected on the role of the NATO PA with respect to NATO and suggested that the Assembly should look more closely at NATO's decision on the use of force and think about mechanisms to co-ordinate this oversight across member countries. Also reflecting on the

NATO PA's role, **Paul Keetch** (UK) called upon the members of the Assembly to assure that national parliaments provide sufficient resources to improve NATO and EU capabilities.

23. The American Ambassador to NATO, **Victoria Nuland**, stressed that NATO should focus more on political processes and see political empowerment in post conflict situations as an exit strategy. In her view, consultations in the NAC had become too narrow and she therefore supported the argument of the Swedish Ambassador for more flexible structures and a stronger integration of security exporters.

24. The former head of the Mauritanian delegation to the NATO PA, **Mr Moussa**, spoke about the situation in Mauritania and said that parliamentary, and later presidential elections in the country are scheduled for 2006 and for 2007 respectively. He urged members to support reform in Mauritania. Ms Pavlicenco drew the attention to the situation in Transnistria and called for the implementation of the resolution adopted previously that called for Russian withdrawal from the region.

25. Referring to Belarus, **Juozas Olekas** (LT) said that it is important to be more active in supporting democratisation of the country. To tackle the grave shortcomings in media access, he suggested creating an information centre on Belarus and asked for political and financial resources to support the Belarusian opposition. Towards the end of the general debate, **Svetlana Zavadskaya**, the wife of a missing journalist from Belarus, commented on the domestic practical developments in Belarus and added that the next elections will not be democratic. She pleaded that support for journalists be of prime importance in order to improve the flow of information. She added that dialogue with the present regime leads to nowhere.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Consideration of the draft General Report *Securing NATO's Role and Relevance* [175 PC 05 E] presented by Bert Koenders (Netherlands), General Rapporteur

26. Following the presentation of the draft General Report, Mr Estrella concurred with the rapporteur that national caveats can significantly hamper NATO-led operations. With regard to the deployment of national forces in international operations, he identified a "double democratic deficit" as these forces escape parliamentary control, both on a national and international level. The rapporteur agreed with this and suggested that national parliaments should work together and learn from each other in controlling defence decisions.

27. On the issue of EU-NATO co-operation, Mr Von Wogau stressed the EU's civil-military capabilities and argued for a clearer delineation of roles. **Loïc Bouvard** (FR) warned that NATO should not supersede national parliaments or the EU. He said that France does not want NATO to become a "political superpower". However, he urged America's allies to increase defence spending to achieve a more balanced United States-European relationship. In the view of the Rapporteur, the political issues should be discussed in NATO, but it must also not be overburdened.

28. Commending on the Assembly's role as an important forum for dialogue, Mr Voinovich suggested drafting a paper explaining the Assembly's relationship with NATO headquarters that would generate increased recognition in the United States Congress. He reiterated the United States' support for NATO, but strongly called on Europe to live up to its financial commitments of 2% of GDP for defence spending. The Chairman acknowledged shortcomings in defence investments among United States Allies, but was sceptical that German military spending could be increased significantly in the short term. Europeans should spend smarter and need to find a better division of labour as well as tackle national caveats, he suggested. In his response,

Mr Koenders agreed that both improvements in procurement co-operation and the level of defence investment is necessary. However, he cautioned that the Allies should focus on “output” rather than fix their eyes on figures like 2%. Furthermore, he saw the danger of resolutions being ineffective when they are watered down if they are not more than the smallest common denominator. **Nikolaï Kamov** (BG) and Mrs Gomes made additional remarks.

The draft General Report [175 PC 05 E] was adopted unanimously.

B. Consideration of the draft Report *NATO and Persian Gulf Security* [177 PCTR 05 E] presented by Ruprecht Polenz (Germany), Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations

29. Following the presentation of the draft report on *NATO and Persian Gulf Security* by the Rapporteur, **Ruprecht Polenz** (DE), **Paolo Casaca** (European Parliament) suggested that the NATO PA should consider election monitoring in Iraq to assist the democratic process underway. In his reply, the Rapporteur asked members to consider this proposal within their national parliaments. Mr Casaca furthermore reminded that the increased rhetoric in Iran against Israel was not limited to the conservative camp.

30. Speakers commended on NATO's willingness to reach out to prospective partners in the context of the Istanbul Co-operation Initiative (ICI). **Baroness Ramsay of Cartvale** (UK) emphasised the need to improve NATO's public diplomacy. Mr Keetch reminded the Committee that training Iraqi security forces is a priority for all NATO countries. On Iran, he warned not to make it only a NATO “problem” and reminded that Iran was, at this point, a UN issue.

31. Addressing the United States-European relationship, **Gordon Smith** (US) reminded the Committee of the demands on the United States to intervene militarily around the world. “The United States’ plate is full and American taxpayers bear the brunt”, he said and called for America's NATO allies to increase their defence budgets. The United States appreciates the assistance it receives in fighting terrorist groups worldwide, the head of the United States Senate delegation to the NATO PA stressed, but added that Europe, too, has an interest in Iraq and in solving the problems in Iran. On Iran, the Senator warned against a policy of appeasement and noted that the United States would “not sit idly by and allow the extermination of Israel”. Arguing that the United States’ commitment to its Asian allies is different from the relations with its European Allies he warned that selling arms to China would be seen as a “hostile act” in the United States.

32. According to the Rapporteur, whether or not NATO should deal with the Iranian nuclear programme reflected the underlying question about the perception of NATO by the members. If consultations really worked within NATO, there would not have been such differing positions. He also admitted that the EU needed to assume stronger responsibility in using “hard power” although he opposed the notion of “hard and soft” power as too simplistic.

33. Mr Estrella recalled that the debate of arms sale to China should not only be led in terms of quantity because it leads to a simplification of the debate and ignores important United States exports to China in terms of quality. **Karl Lamers** (DE) made additional remarks.

The draft Report [177 PCTR 05 E] was adopted unanimously.

C. Consideration of the draft Report *NATO-EU Security Co-operation* [176 PCNP 05 E] by Marco Minniti (Italy), Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on NATO Partnerships

34. Welcoming the draft report of the Rapporteur, **Ioannis Papantoniou** (GR) proposed the creation of an ad hoc group for co-ordination and a high-level task force to draw up a report for

governments. Mr Casule emphasised that EU-NATO co-operation is working successfully on the ground, as operations in Macedonia have proved.

35. Mr Van Winsen was concerned about an inward-looking EU and proposed that ESDP should be further developed with regard to combating terrorist groups. The Rapporteur agreed that the EU could do more in fighting terrorist organisations. More generally, he stressed that the EU must avoid navel gazing and needs to offer the Balkan peninsula a European perspective at least in the long term. The Rapporteur announced the update of minor parts of the report to include the adoption of a police reform by the Bosnian Parliament.

The draft report [176 PCNP 05 E] was adopted unanimously.

IV. RESOLUTIONS

A. Consideration of amendments and vote on the draft Resolution on *NATO Transformation and the Future of the Alliance* [198 PC 05 E] presented by Bert Koenders (Netherlands)

36. Nine amendments were submitted to the draft Resolution on *NATO Transformation and the Future of the Alliance*. Of these, the following amendments were:

37. **accepted:** amendment 8 (Mr Pilka, Mr Agov, Mr Zaborowski); amendment 9 (Mr Pilka, Mr Agov, Mr Zaborowski); amendment 7 (Mr Meckel, Mr Bouvard, Mr Mikser, Mr Olekas, Mr Estrella).

38. **rejected:** amendment 2 (Mr Estrella), amendment 6 (Mr Meckel, Mr Bouvard, Mr Mikser, Mr Olekas, Mr Estrella); amendment 1 (Mr Erdem, Mr Batu), however, an oral amendment was accepted unanimously to substitute '*as a result of the unresolved Cyprus-Malta issue;*' by '*because of unresolved issues arising from the recent enlargement of the European Union;*' amendment 5 (Mr Estrella);

39. Amendments 3 and 4 (Mr Estrella) were **withdrawn**, but paragraph 3 was orally amended by deleting the words '*and relationship with Operation Enduring Freedom*'

40. The draft resolution [198 PC 05 E], as amended, was adopted.

B. Consideration of amendments and vote on the draft Resolution on *Kosovo* [198 PC 5 E] presented by Bert Koenders (Netherlands) and Marco Minniti (Italy)

41. The **delegation of Serbia** made a few comments on the original draft version of the text and referred to the "conditional independence". Twenty-seven amendments were submitted to the draft Resolution on *Kosovo*, which was introduced by Marco Minniti. Of these, the following amendments were:

42. **accepted:** amendment 14 (Mr Ozerov, Ms Sliska); amendment 1 (Mr Forcieri, Mr Chandler, Mr Tancredo, Mr Udall, Mr Casule); amendment 23 (Mr Estrella, Mr Keetch, Mr Lello, Mr Bouvard); amendment 7 (Mr Lupoi); amendments 2 and 3 (Mr Forcieri, Mr Chandler, Mr Tancredo, Mr Udall, Mr Casule); amendment 10 (Mr Lupoi), orally amended to add '*including the effective protection of the cultural and religious heritage of Kosovo*' at the end of new paragraph 8b; amendment 25 (Mr Meckel, Mr Olekas, Mr Banas); amendment 5 (Mr Forcieri, Mr Chandler, Mr Tancredo, Mr Udall, Mr Casule); amendment 6 (Mr Forcieri, Mr Chandler, Mr Tancredo, Mr Udall, Mr Casule,

Mr Ozerov, Ms Sliska, Mr Pilka, Mr Agov, Ms Nicolai, Mr Zaborowski, Mr Meckel, Mr Banas, Mr Estrella);

43. All other amendments were **withdrawn**.

44. **The draft resolution [225 PC 05 E], as amended, was adopted.**

C. Consideration of amendments and vote on the draft Resolution on *Belarus* [227 PC 05 E] presented by Markus Meckel (Germany) and Bert Koenders (Netherlands)

45. Before the introduction of the draft resolution, the Chairman gave the floor to Svyetlana Zavadskaya. She said that Belarusians already lived under a dictatorship and appealed to the members to avoid official contact with Belarusian government representatives involved in crime, e.g., abductions of political opponents to the regime, journalists and those who continue to harass them.

46. Six amendments were submitted to the draft Resolution on *Belarus*. Of these, the following amendments were:

47. **accepted:** amendment 1, orally amended to be inserted after paragraph 4 (Mr Olekas, Mr Rasnacs, Mr Pilka, Mr Bouvard, Mr Van Winsen, Ms Nicolai, Mr Talpes); an oral amendment by Mr Meckel to paragraph 5 of the draft Resolution to include after 'political opponents' the words "*in 1999 and 2000*"; an oral amendment to paragraph 6a of the draft Resolution to replace the words '*electoral process is*' by '*presidential elections 2006 are*';

48. **rejected:** amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (Mr Ozerov, Ms Sliska)

49. Following the votes on individual paragraphs, **the draft Resolution [227 PC 05 E], as amended, was adopted unanimously.**

V. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES IN 2005 AND 2006 AND ELECTION OF COMMITTEE AND SUB-COMMITTEE OFFICERS

50. Towards the end of the meeting, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on NATO Partnerships, Mr Lamers, informed the Committee about the Sub-Committee's 2005 activities and the scheduled visits for 2006. **Assen Agov** (BG), Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations, spoke about the visits of the Sub-Committee in 2005 and those planned for the following year.

51. All officers of the Committee eligible for re-election were confirmed in their positions. Three positions were vacant and the following persons were elected:

52. As Vice-Chairmen of the Political Committee: **Mr Nikolai Kamov** (Bulgaria) and **Mr Rui Gomes da Silva** (Portugal). As Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations: **Mr Juozas Olekas** (Lithuania).

53. Thanking the Danish host delegation for a flawless and pleasant organisation of the Session in Copenhagen, **Mr Meckel closed the meeting.**
