

Canadian NATO
Parliamentary Association



Association parlementaire
canadienne de l'OTAN

**Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation
respecting its participation at the Meeting of the Standing
Committee and Secretaries of Delegation**

Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)

**Ponta Delgada, The Azores, Portugal
April 2, 2011**

Report

The Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association has the honour to present its report on the Meeting of the Standing Committee and the Secretaries of Delegation, held in Ponta Delgada, The Azores, Portugal April 1-2, 2011. Canada was represented by, Senator Raynell Andreychuk, Senator Jane Cordy, Senator Joseph A. Day Senator Pierre Claude Nolin and Mr. James Latimer, Association Secretary.

SECRETARIES OF DELEGATION MEETING

The Secretaries of Delegation met on Friday, April 1st, and the meeting was chaired by Ms. Patricia Graves, Secretary of the Portuguese Delegation. Topics discussed were as follows:

- Overview of the programme of the meetings in Ponta Delgada
- Consideration of the Draft Agenda of the Standing Committee meeting.
- Discussion regarding preparation of the Spring Session in Varna, Bulgaria, from 27 – 30 May June 2011
 - Draft Programme
 - Programme for Accompanying Persons
 - General Information
- Discussion regarding preparation of the 57th Annual Session in Bucharest, Romania from 7 to 10 October 2011
 - Draft Programme
- Discussion regarding preparation of future sessions and meetings
 - Standing Committee meeting in 2012
 - Spring Session in Tallinn, Estonia, 25 – 28 May 2012
 - Annual Session in Prague, Czech Republic, 9-13 November 2012
 - Meetings in 2013 and 2014
- Discussion regarding the liaison between Delegations and the International Secretariat

Other business.

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING

The President, Dr Karl A. Lamers (DE), opened the meeting at 09.05. He asked members of the Standing Committee to observe a minute's silence in honour of the victims of the devastating earthquake and tsunami which struck Japan on 11 March 2011.

The President then thanked the Head of the Portuguese delegation, José Lello, and the Regional Government of The Azores, for their hosting of the Standing Committee meeting and for the previous evening's reception.

José Lello (PT) thanked the President.

The President welcomed Carlos César, President of the Regional Government of The Azores.

Carlos César welcomed participants. He emphasized the centrality of The Azores, in the middle of the Atlantic, and at the heart of the Atlantic Alliance between Europe and North America. Recalling that NATO's new Strategic Concept reaffirmed that "the transatlantic link remains as strong, and as important to the preservation of Euro-Atlantic peace and security, as ever", and that the Alliance is based on a common commitment to preserve the freedom and security of all members, and on the principle of indivisibility of security, Mr César argued that these very principles have made NATO the most long-standing and efficient military alliance in recent history, and must to continue to guide its action in the world.

The President thanked Mr César for his remarks, and for welcoming the Assembly to The Azores. This meeting brought together members of parliament from both sides of the Atlantic to exchange views and ideas on some of the key issues facing the Alliance, including challenging operations in Afghanistan, Libya and elsewhere, ongoing developments in North Africa and the Middle East, and implementation of the important decisions taken by Alliance Heads of State and Government at the Lisbon Summit in November 2010.

The Secretary General, David Hobbs, welcomed new heads of delegation to the meeting. Apologies had been received from the following members of the Standing Committee:

- Leonard DEMI (AL)
- Eftychios DAMIANAKIS (GR)
- Mihaly BALLA (HU)
- Jadwiga ZAKRZEWSKA (PL)
- Juraj DROBA (SK)
- Mike TURNER (US)

The President outlined the items on the draft Agenda. It was unusual to have a guest speaker at such meetings, but, on this occasion, Professor Pedro Gomes Barbosa had been invited in recognition of the relevance and importance of the ongoing developments in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA).

The draft Agenda was adopted.

The summary of the Standing Committee meeting held in Warsaw was adopted.

Presentation by Professor Pedro Gomes Barbosa, Professor at the University of Lisbon, on The developing situation in the Middle East and North Africa, followed by a question and answer period

The President welcomed Professor Barbosa.

Professor Barbosa stressed that it was important to understand the historical and religious context in which recent popular movements in North Africa and the Middle East had taken place, as well as the substantial differences between these movements.

Tunisia's history sets it apart from other countries in the region, Professor Barbosa emphasized. Corruption and unemployment – in a country which lacks natural resources – were the main drivers of the “Jasmine Revolution”. Although there was always a risk that dissatisfaction was manipulated, Professor Barbosa argued that Islamist movements would find it difficult to spread in a context where young people aspiring for a better life, and women, had been key actors in the popular uprisings.

This contrasted with the situation in Egypt, Professor Barbosa stressed, where Islamist groups and ideas were much more influential. Assessing the exact strength of these movements was difficult, however. Thus, while the Muslim Brotherhood officially pursued a non-violent agenda, dissident members of the Brotherhood – including young people from Egypt's educated middle class – had established or joined terrorist movements. One prominent member of the Brotherhood was even among Al Qaeda's senior leadership. Nevertheless, an important element in developments in Egypt was that power had fallen to the military rather than the street. Professor Barbosa insisted that, in the current context, what Egypt needed most was economic assistance, and called on Western governments to focus on this aspect as a matter of priority.

Developments in Libya were even more confusing, Professor Barbosa explained. Few observers expected a popular revolt there, and it was still difficult to predict who would emerge as the leading force in the country. While it was now clear that the conflict involved two armed groups, it was still unclear who the rebels really were, Professor Barbosa noted. According to him, the jihadist movement also continued to pose a threat in Libya. Professor Barbosa thus argued that the situation was likely to remain unstable in the near future, although he did not believe that the country seriously risked breaking apart.

The President thanked Professor Barbosa and opened the debate to the Assembly's members.

Professor Barbosa agreed with Jesus Cuadrado (ES) and Jean-Michel Boucheron (FR) that developments in Egypt and Tunisia should be seen with a certain degree of optimism, and supported Vahit Erdem's (TK) view that popular movements in the region were not driven by religion. However, he warned against turning a blind eye to the threat posed by jihadist movements, insisting that these retained a strong presence in the region and could take advantage of the current turmoil.

Responding to a question by Hugh Bayley (UK) on the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, he noted that the movement had undergone a generational shift, and that the new elite had a more liberal and open agenda, even challenging some of the legacy from the “old guard”. However, the Brotherhood should not be seen as a unified block, he warned. Professor Barbosa also argued that the Egyptian army would likely resist any attempt by Islamist forces to take over power.

Responding to comments and questions by Erna Solberg (NO) and Senator Sergio de Gregorio (IT), Professor Barbosa repeated his call for Western governments

to focus their assistance towards social and economic development as the best way to break down the influence of Islamist fundamentalism. He also challenged the idea that the Turkish model would be easily applicable to the region.

Asked by Sever Voinescu-Cotoi (RO) and Mr Lello about the prospects for solving the current crisis in Libya, and the danger of Al Qaeda infiltration, Professor Barbosa repeated that the current situation in Libya was very fluid, unclear and uncertain, which provided fertile ground for infiltrations by extremist movements. He noted that there had, so far, been little reaction in the public opinion of the region to NATO's Libyan intervention.

Finally, Professor Barbosa agreed with Petras Austrevicius (LT) that current events in North Africa and the Middle East could not be compared to the wave of democratisation in Central and Eastern Europe in the 1990s.

The President thanked Professor Barbosa on behalf of the Assembly. Responding to a question by Hendrik Jan Ormel (NL) about the planned activities of the Assembly's Mediterranean and Middle East Special Group (GSM) in relation to developments in the region, the President invited members to discuss this matter under items 5 and 7 of the agenda.

Future assembly activities:

- Assembly Consideration of Security and Gender in 2011

The President summarised the evolution of the Assembly's approach to the issue of gender and security, and presented the proposed list of activities relating to this issue in 2011, namely:

- participation in a NATO conference on the Implementation of United Nations' Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325;
- monitoring of the implementation of UNSCR 1325 in the Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security; and
- a discussion of gender-related issues at the Rose-Roth Seminar on Afghanistan to be held in London in November.

Sir Menzies Campbell (UK), Mr Ormel, Marit Nybakk (NO), Mr Lello and Jane Cordy (CA) all felt that the proposed programme of activities was insufficient, and that the issue of gender and security needed to feature more prominently and more regularly on the Assembly's agenda, including at plenary sittings during sessions. Topics of particular relevance and interest, they suggested, included the role of women in emerging democracies in North Africa and the Middle East, particularly with regard to the democratic control of the armed forces, and the experience of women in the military in theatres of operation.

Raynell Andreychuk (CA) also stressed that UNSCR 1325 was only one of four resolutions adopted by the United Nations on this issue, and regretted that these resolutions were not yet fully operational within NATO. This issue cut across the areas of responsibility of all the Assembly's Committees, and therefore needed to be dealt more broadly.

Ulla Schmidt (DE) pointed out that consideration of the issue within the Assembly needed to be complemented by discussions at the national level as well.

The Committee agreed that the issue of gender and security was an important priority for the Assembly, that it should feature prominently on the agenda of the Annual Session in Bucharest, and that all Committees should be seeking to contribute to the Assembly's coverage of the issue.

- **Assembly Activities and Subjects in 2011**
- Letter from Messrs. Helge Adam Moeller and John Dyrby Paulsen, Head and Deputy Head of the Danish Delegation Concerning the Assembly's Activities Relating to Piracy

The President explained that planned activities for 2011 had been adjusted mainly as a result of ongoing developments in North Africa and the Middle East and of the outcomes of the NATO Summit in Lisbon in November 2010.

The Secretary General presented the proposed changes in greater detail, and reviewed the updated list of priorities. A further addition was a suggestion to organise a meeting of the Georgia-NATO Interparliamentary Council at NATO Headquarters some time after the Annual Session. The President also suggested organising fact-finding visits to Egypt and Tunisia in the course of 2011.

John Dyrby Paulsen (DK) presented the argument made in his letter to the Secretary General that the Assembly should pay closer attention to the growing threat of maritime piracy. Ms Solberg, Joseph A. Day (CA), Senator Josselin de Rohan (FR), Mr Bayley, Ms Cordy and Antonio Cabras (IT) all supported this proposal. It was pointed out that the Defence and Security Committee would address piracy as part of its report on NATO operations and that it would continue to follow the issue in 2012. A specific proposal was made to invite Jack Lang, who had acted as Special Adviser to the UN Secretary General on legal issues related to piracy off the coast of Somalia, to address the Committee.

Lord Jopling (UK) suggested that migration and refugee flows was another timely and relevant topic for the Assembly. This issue had taken even greater prominence as a result of the instability connected with popular uprisings in North Africa and the Middle East. Senator de Gregorio supported this proposal.

Mr Ormel, Mr Erdem, Mr Cabras, Mr Voinescu-Cotoi and Philippe Mahoux (BE) all supported the President's proposal of fact-finding visits to Egypt and Tunisia. Mr Cabras argued that links also needed to be established with regional organisations, including in particular the Arab League. Mr Voinescu-Cotoi proposed to focus on those countries in the region with which NATO already has established partnerships. He also noted that developments in MENA provide a welcome opportunity for strengthening links to the European Parliament, and suggested that the Assembly should enquire with the European Parliament about possible avenues for cooperation in the region. Mr Mahoux mentioned the newly established Contact Group on Libya as another important interlocutor.

Finally, Mr Austrevicius said that, in the light of the dramatic nuclear incidents in Japan, the Assembly should hold a discussion on nuclear security.

The Committee agreed the following proposed changes to the Assembly activities for 2011:

- A shift in priorities to reflect events in the MENA region and the outcomes of the NATO Lisbon Summit;
- The revised list of report subjects for 2011;
- The revised list of activities for 2011, including the following specific points:
 - The two Brussels-based seminars to be organised with the European Parliament and/or DCAF;
 - Adjustments to the programmes for the CDS (joint meeting in Ukraine with the Ukraine-NATO Interparliamentary Council) and the STC (visit to Spain instead of the United Kingdom);
 - A special meeting in Brussels with the Georgian delegation towards the end of 2011, which would involve members of the Bureau and Committee chairpersons;
- The preparation of an information document for the Spring Session in Varna on the NATO Lisbon decisions and their implementation;
- The incorporation of priority areas into the regular planning process;
- A more flexible arrangement for Bureau participation in activities relating to key Assembly priorities.

The Committee also agreed the following further adjustments:

- To put the issue of refugees on the agenda of the Annual Session in Bucharest, most likely in the Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security;
- To enhance the Assembly's coverage of piracy, with the Defence and Security Committee taking the lead on this issue; if possible, include a discussion of Jack Lang's report on the agenda for the Spring Session in Varna;
- To organise fact-finding visits to Egypt and Tunisia in 2011, possibly in cooperation with the European Parliament;
- To invite a speaker in the Science and Technology Committee in Varna to discuss the aftermath and lessons learned of the nuclear crisis in Japan, and follow up on this issue;
- To invite the Japanese delegation to the Assembly exceptionally to attend the Spring Session in Varna.

The Secretary General also asked the Standing Committee for advance authorisation for the Assembly to send a delegation to observe the forthcoming parliamentary elections in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* on 5 June, if invited. He

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

reminded members that the Assembly only engaged in election monitoring in exceptional circumstances, mostly in NATO candidate countries. The Assembly had not yet received an invitation to observe the elections in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, but an advance authorisation by the Standing Committee would allow necessary planning to be made ahead of time should such an invitation be received.

Mr Lello argued that election monitoring was not a core task for the Assembly and that other bodies were better suited to perform this function.

The Standing Committee approved the Assembly's participation in the monitoring of parliamentary elections in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia with 14 votes in favour and 7 against, provided that the Assembly received an invitation from the national authorities.

- **Structure of the Joint Committee Meetings held in Brussels, Belgium, each February**

The President explained that a new structure had been tried for the Joint Committee Meetings in Brussels in February 2011, and asked for members' comments on their preferred formula.

Sir Menzies regretted that the SHAPE briefings had not been up to the level one could have expected. In contrast, Branko Grims (SI) and Jan Hamacek (CZ) both appreciated the opportunity to go to SHAPE and meet with the military leaders of the Alliance.

Both Mr Erdem and Mr Bayley supported going back to the previous arrangement, as it had proved difficult to set up meetings with high-level EU officials for a greatly reduced group of members. Mr Bayley also supported the idea of condensing all meetings over two days, instead of two and a half days.

José Luis Arnaut (PT) disagreed with the suggestion made in the document of visiting the European Parliament to discuss defence issues of common interest. He noted that defence matters were the responsibility of national parliaments.

The Secretary General took note of Mr Bayley's proposal to condense meetings into two days. He also explained that several options could be envisaged for the Monday afternoon programme; this could be tailored each year. Finally, he suggested inviting speakers from SHAPE to address the group in Brussels rather than members travelling to Mons.

The Standing Committee agreed to leave the Secretary General the liberty to elaborate a proposal for 2012 taking into account the considerations raised in the discussion.

Update by Senator Pierre Claude Nolin (Canada), Chairman of the Working Group on Assembly Reform, following the meeting of the Group in Brussels, Belgium on Saturday, 19 February 2011

The Treasurer and Chair of the Working Group Pierre Claude Nolin (CA) introduced the latest report of the Working Group.

Lord Jopling asked for a clarification on the Working Group's proposals regarding accompanying persons.

The Standing Committee supported all proposals of the Working Group, namely:

- Contributions from non-member delegations: no action should be taken in seeking mandatory or voluntary contributions to the Assembly's budget from non-member delegations, but the contribution from non-member delegations in terms of hosting meetings and seminars should be monitored;
- Consideration of the work of the GSM at the Assembly's Annual Session: the report and work of the GSM should be considered by one of the Committees during the Assembly's annual session;
- Observers and accompanying persons at sessions: each delegate in the Assembly's sessions should be limited to one designated and officially accredited accompanying person; the Accompanying Persons' Programme should be closed to non-parliamentary observers, with a degree of flexibility for senior NATO and SHAPE officials;
- A policy on side events at sessions: side events should only take place in exceptional circumstances and exclusively upon an initiative generated by the host nation or a member delegation; they should be agreed by the host nation and the Standing Committee or the Bureau in the interval between meetings of the Standing Committee; side events should cover an issue of relevance to NATO or the Assembly, and should not time-conflict with any of the official session meetings.
- Guidelines on the circulation of non-official documents at sessions: requests for the circulation of non-official documents at sessions needed to be approved by the Committee Chair on the basis of the document's relevance to the Committee's work; exceptions were made for NATO documents and publications by the Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of the Armed Forces;
- Use of non-official languages at sessions, on visits and seminars: delegations should be encouraged to appoint members with a working knowledge of one of the two official languages of the Assembly; whispering interpretation should be avoided whenever possible, and delegations should be encouraged to use portable interpretation equipment of the highest standard on Committee visits; the guidelines for Committee Chairs should be reviewed to include the question of the use of non-official languages on Committee visits.

Mr Lello asked how interpretation by non-NATO host nations might be affected. Senator Nolin suggested that case-by-case exceptions were possible.

The President thanked the Working Group and its Chair for their work and creative solutions.

Proposals for Assembly Involvement in the Provision of Democratic Assistance to the Middle East and North Africa

The President outlined his view that the Assembly was already addressing the issue of the ongoing changes in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and described the solid framework for cooperation with the countries in the region through the GSM, and their attendance at various Assembly events. Besides this political engagement, the President argued that the Assembly should also be prepared to provide assistance in

the field of security sector reform and democratic control of the armed forces, if requested - as it had done in Central and Eastern Europe in the 1990s.

The Secretary General explained that the purpose of this discussion was to collect members' input on what they thought the Assembly could provide as a body in this respect. He noted his discussion with the head of the Turkish delegation on a possible seminar in 2012 in Turkey. He also reported on informal contacts at staff level with other potential partners.

Ms Solberg and Mr Voinescu-Cotoi both commended the document and its proposals, but they called for a more pro-active stance than simply waiting for a request for assistance. Mr Voinescu-Cotoi proposed reaching out to those partner organisations, such as the OSCE and the European Parliament, which were likely to receive requests of assistance, and seeking ways to cooperate. Mr Erdem also suggested prioritising the Assembly's proposals for assistance, and informing countries of the region that the Assembly stands ready to help, in particular through the previously-discussed idea of a fact-finding mission to the region.

Should he be in a position to do so following the parliamentary elections, Mr Erdem suggested that he would be pleased to host the proposed seminar in Turkey next year. Mr Voinescu-Cotoi also supported this proposal of a Rose-Roth Seminar in 2012 dedicated to events in the region, an initiative which, in his view, should be made permanent.

Mr Ormel, Mr Cabras, and Mr Erdem stressed the central role that the GSM should play in coordinating the Assembly's efforts.

Ms Solberg suggested focusing on the younger generation of parliamentarians and future leaders, and networking them to young leaders in NATO countries. She also called for looking into the role of women, and their contribution to democracy-building.

Mr Ormel stated that the Assembly not only had an interest in assistance as such, but also in connection with other key interests. He agreed that the Assembly's contribution should be limited to its core business in security and defence. Israel should be involved as soon as possible, he argued, and the relation to the Middle East peace process must also be weighed.

Mr Cabras and Mr Voinescu-Cotoi underlined the differences between what happened in the former Soviet Union 20 years' ago and recent events in the MENA region. The Assembly should be prepared to provide assistance, Mr Cabras stated, but he called for humility, and for acting as peers wishing to exchange experiences rather than as teachers.

Ms Schmidt stressed the importance of developing a political strategy to support the democratic forces in the region now, as well as in the long term, when the hostilities end. The Assembly's Committees should be engaged in discussing all relevant aspects of developments in the region.

Ms Andreychuk stated that member states had been working in these areas already; the new element would be a NATO-specific strategy. She added that the paper could acknowledge the profound differences between the countries involved, and that the Assembly should focus on complementarity with other organisations working in this

field, on the basis of a full assessment of the capacities they already possessed. It was also important to take into account new players in the region, including Brazil, China, and India.

Mr Cuadrado stressed the importance of the principle of multilateralism, and called for the strengthening of links with regional organisations in the region, including the Arab League and the Organisation of the Islamic Conference. He strongly supported the recognition of the responsibility to protect.

1. The President thanked members for the productive debate and summarised the key points made, namely:

- developments in the region were a key priority for the Assembly;
- the opportunity should be used to work together with other organisations in a common effort; contacts should also be established with regional institutions;
- assistance efforts should also involve a broader spectrum of partners from civil society, with a particular emphasis on young people;
- the Assembly's commitment to its values was important, but it should recognise that the nations concerned were masters of their own destiny, and deliver its assistance in full respect of their history and culture, acknowledging the specificities of each;
- the fact-finding mission should be prepared carefully, and humility should be a key attribute when approaching counterparts in the region.

Relations with Belarus

The President explained that when the situation in Belarus was last discussed a year previously, the Standing Committee agreed not to make any changes in the terms of the Assembly's relations with the country, to keep the developing political situation in the country under review, and to discuss the evolving situation periodically. Since then, the situation had deteriorated following the flawed presidential election in December 2010 and the intensified repression of the opposition. The President asked for the Standing Committee's view on the suggestion made in the document that, given recent developments, the Assembly's coverage of Belarus could be considered sufficient, and that the Standing Committee could review the situation again at a later stage, on the basis of the report currently being prepared by the Political Committee on the situation in Belarus

Both Lord Jopling and Daniel Bacquelaine (BE) noted that recent events had confirmed that the Assembly had been right to adopt a cautious approach. Both therefore favoured maintaining the current status quo in relations with Belarusian authorities. However, Mr Bacquelaine stated that his report for the Political Committee would also call for greater support to civil society and the Belarusian opposition.

Mr Boucheron agreed that it would be wrong to restore Belarus' previous status with the Assembly, but he also felt that ways should be explored to develop some form of dialogue, including with the authorities in Minsk.

Mr Austrevicius agreed that isolation was never a good solution, but argued that bridges needed to be built with the population rather than the leadership of the country. He also suggested that the Assembly should publicise its position on developments in Belarus.

The Standing Committee agreed that these suggestions should be incorporated into the Political Committee's report, and that the situation should be reviewed at a later stage.

Ms Andreychuk stressed that the situation in Belarus continued to evolve and deserved further attention. In particular, the diaspora was playing a more active role, and new ideas were tested to communicate the opposition's message throughout the country.

Participation of the Delegation of the Russian Federation in Assembly Activities

The President explained the background and chronology of the restrictions imposed by the Standing Committee on the participation of the Russian delegation in certain Assembly activities. He recalled that since the Standing Committee's decision in Memphis in March 2010 to reopen Rose Roth seminars to Russian participation, the only remaining restrictions related to Committee and Sub-Committee visits and GSM activities. While noting that the reasons for which the restrictions were adopted in the first place had not disappeared and that Russia remained a challenging partner, the President argued that the Assembly could not ignore the fact that the Lisbon NATO Summit had marked a "reset" of NATO-Russia relations, and that, on many key security challenges, cooperation with Russia was essential.

Taking these considerations into account, he put forward a proposal which, he hoped, could reconcile all viewpoints within the Assembly. He proposed a step-by-step pragmatic approach, whereby a decision would be made on a case-by-case basis as to whether Russian participation in any given Committee or Sub-Committee visit would be beneficial. The decision of whether to open a particular visit to Russian participation would be left to the relevant Chairperson and to the host delegation. If necessary, a Sub-committee Chairperson could consult the Chairperson of the full Committee. Guidance from the Standing Committee (or the Bureau, if time did not allow for consultation with the Standing Committee) could also be sought if need be. The President suggested that this arrangement would be reviewed after a year, and said that he would discuss the possibility of organising a Bureau visit to Russia in the second half of 2011 with the Russian delegation. As for participation at sessions, the President favoured maintaining the size of the Russian delegation at its current level of 10 delegates.

Senator de Gregorio, Mr Lello, Helge Adam Moller (DK), Mr Ormel, Ms Nybakk, Ms Schmidt, Mr Erdem, Norbert Hauptert (LU) all agreed with the President's proposal. Loïc Bouvard (FR) also supported the proposed arrangement, but wished it had come sooner and went further. Senator de Gregorio suggested that the Russian delegation should also be invited to participate in meetings of the GSM, as well as the Parliamentary Transatlantic Forum.

The Secretary General told delegates that the Head of the American delegation had informed him that he supported the President's proposal, provided that the default position remained that the Russian delegation could not participate in Committee and Sub-Committee visits unless explicitly invited at the initiative of the Sub-Committee

Chair and the host delegation. Senator Cordy endorsed this description of the arrangement, and emphasized that the decision had to be taken jointly with the host country.

Sir Menzies disagreed with the President's proposal, noting that there had been no progress in resolving the conflicts over Abkhazia and South Ossetia, that the proposal made no mention of the steps which were expected from Russia in return, that the Assembly needed a clear policy rather than individual decisions which risked being perceived as inconsistent, and that Sessions provided ample opportunity for dialogue with the Russian delegation. He was also concerned that this step would later lead to full reengagement, which he opposed, warning that it would be difficult to then return to a more restrictive formula.

Imants Liegis (LV) also opposed the President's proposal, arguing that the Assembly should base its decision on the reciprocal steps taken by Russia rather than on the wider context.

Mr Austrevicius asked on what criteria the reassessment of the proposed arrangement would be based on in a year's time. Both he and Mr Voinescu-Cotoi suggested the postponement of the decision until the meeting of the NATO-Russia Parliamentary Committee (NRPC) in Varna in May 2011.

Mr Voinescu-Cotoi also argued that the Assembly's decision to re-open Rose-Roth seminars to Russian participation had not led to any reciprocal step from the Russian delegation, and warned against the Assembly being perceived as inconsistent and divided. Lord Jopling echoed this fear that leaving the decision to Sub-Committee Chairs could give the impression that the Standing Committee was too divided to decide itself. He also recalled recent occasions at which the Russian delegation had had the opportunity to engage in dialogue, but had chosen not to.

Mr Bayley supported a graduated and reciprocal approach. He agreed that the Assembly needed to make clear what was expected of the Russian delegation, and proposed seeking some form of commitment from the Heads of the Russian delegation in Varna. He suggested for instance that Russian delegates should be expected to remain in the room when the topic of Georgia was being discussed, and to consistently attend all meetings on Sub-Committee and Committee visits. To limit the risk of inconsistency, Mr Bayley also suggested that the Standing Committee review the visits that could be opened to Russian participation in Varna. Finally, he opposed opening participation in the Parliamentary Transatlantic Forum to the Russian delegation.

On the question of the Parliamentary Transatlantic Forum, the Secretary General reminded members that the Standing Committee had taken the decision to limit participation in the Forum to member delegations and associate delegations from EU countries only.

Senator Day expressed concern about possible complications implicit in the proposed arrangement, particularly in the case of joint Committee visits, as well as about past experiences of the disruptive behaviour by Russian delegates on past Committee visits.

Senator Nolin insisted that the Standing Committee could not keep postponing a decision on this issue, and urged the Committee to take a stance.

Sir Menzies called for a roll-call vote, which the Standing Committee agreed to.

The following delegations voted in favour of the President's proposal: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, and Turkey. The following delegations voted against the President's proposal: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania and the United Kingdom.

The President's proposal was adopted by the Committee with 17 votes in favour and 5 against. It was thus agreed that:

- the leader of a visiting delegation (normally the Sub-Committee Chairperson, or in the case of a joint visit, the two respective Sub-Committee Chairpersons) and the Head of the host country delegation may decide to open participation in that visit to the delegation of the Russian Federation, in cases where they believed that Russian participation would contribute to the substance of the meeting;
- should he/she deem it necessary, the respective Sub-Committee Chairperson may seek guidance from the Committee Chairperson. If needed, further guidance could be sought from the Standing Committee, or, during the intervals between Standing Committee meetings, the Bureau of the Assembly;
- a similar procedure should be followed for GSM activities;
- this arrangement would be reviewed after one year;
- the President would seek the Russian delegation's agreement on a Bureau visit to Russia in the second half of 2011;
- the size of the Russian delegation at sessions would remain at 10 delegates.

Enhancing the Assembly's profile and public outreach

Given time constraints, the President proposed the postponement of the discussion of this item until the Standing Committee's next meeting in Varna, Bulgaria, in May 2011.

The Standing Committee agreed to postpone the discussion of this item.

Comments of the Secretary General of NATO and Chairman of the North Atlantic Council on the Policy Recommendations adopted in 2010 by the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

The President called the attention of the Committee to the Comments of the Secretary General of NATO on the Policy Recommendations of the NATO PA.

Finance:

- Report of the Secretary General on the Financial Statements for 2010
- Financial Statements for 2010 approved by the Secretary General
- Treasurer's report and proposal for the allocation of the 2010 surplus

The Treasurer explained that the 2010 Financial Year had closed with a surplus, and suggested two ways of allocating this surplus. One was to update the 2011 budget to adjust some budget articles which required additional funding due to unforeseen circumstances following the initial draft of the 2011 budget. He proposed increases to: Chapter 1 (Personnel Costs) to take into account several personnel changes within the International Secretariat which had financial implications for the 2011 Financial Year only; Chapter 2 article 8 (Computer Equipment) to finance a redesign of the Assembly's website; and Chapter 4 (Missions and External Relations) to cover the additional expense generated by the organisation of a Rose-Roth seminar on Afghanistan in London. Secondly, the Treasurer proposed allocating part of the surplus to augment the Emergency Fund.

Mr Arnaut asked why the proposed seminar on Afghanistan had to be held in London if the UK delegation was unable to offer a venue. The Secretary General explained that London had been chosen because the city offered easy access to a large pool of experts on Afghanistan. He also clarified that, although the UK Parliament did not have a suitable conference room, the UK delegation was planning to contribute to the costs for the seminar. However, a reasonable share of the financial burden would have to be covered through the Assembly's budget in order to cover the costs of the Afghan delegation participation, including the necessary interpretation.

The Standing Committee adopted the financial documents.

Future sessions and meetings:

- Distribution of Assembly Sessions and Standing Committee Meetings
- Sessions and Meetings from 2011
- Spring Session, Varna, Bulgaria, 27 to 30 May 2011
- 57th Annual Session, Bucharest, Romania, 7 - 11 October 2011

The President explained that two offers had been received from Luxembourg and Albania to host the Spring Session in 2013. The Bureau's recommendation was to accept the offer from Luxembourg as it had been received by the International Secretariat first. The President further explained that Luxembourg's offer to host the 2013 Spring Session would mean that their earlier offer to host the early spring Standing Committee in 2012 would need to be withdrawn. A host therefore needed to be found for that meeting, and Albania would be consulted first. The President also informed the Committee that an offer had been received from Croatia to host the Annual Session in 2013.

Marija Pejcinovic Buric (HR) expressed her satisfaction that the Croatian Parliament would be hosting the Annual Session in 2013.

The President further informed the Committee about the offer received from Lithuania to host the Spring Session in 2014 and the tentative offer from The Netherlands to host the Annual Session in 2014.

Lord Jopling strongly urged future hosts to choose venues near major airports in order to reduce travel and transfer costs for delegations.

Mr Boucheron informed the Committee that the French Parliament would be willing to host a future meeting of the Standing Committee in Caen.

Dobroslav Dimitrov (BG) and Mr Voinescu-Cotoi briefed the Standing Committee on preparations for the forthcoming Spring Session in Varna in May 2011 and Annual Session in Bucharest in October 2011 respectively.

Mr Lello informed the Standing Committee that due to the forthcoming parliamentary election in Portugal, most members of the delegation would likely not be present in Varna.

The President thanked all delegations for their offers to host meetings, and agreed with Lord Jopling that it was important to make every effort to reduce the cost of meetings.

Miscellaneous

The President asked the Standing Committee for comments on the proposed draft statement on NATO operations in Libya

Senator Day fully supported the proposed draft.

Mr Grims suggested replacing the words “we hope” with a phrase that would more clearly express the Alliance’s determination to achieve the operation’s objectives.

Mr Lello regretted that the resolution did not emphasize enough that the reason for NATO’s engagement in Libya is to defend human lives and that the priority is a diplomatic resolution of the crisis.

Sir Menzies suggested adding the word “legal” to the reference to the mandate given by UN Security Council Resolution 1973. This would emphasize even more strongly the fact that NATO operations in Libya were conducted in full accordance with the UN mandate.

Mr Hauptert felt that the translation of the word “clear” with “*sans ambiguïté*” in the French version was too strong, and suggested using a different translation.

The President accepted the proposed amendments from Slovenia, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom.

The draft statement, as amended, was adopted.

The President thanked the Standing Committee, and again thanked Mr Lello and the Portuguese delegation for their hospitality.

The meeting closed at 17:45.

Respectfully submitted,

The Honourable Senator Jane Cordy
Canadian NATO Parliamentary
Association (NATO PA)

Travel Costs

ASSOCIATION	Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)
ACTIVITY	Meeting of the Standing Committee and the Secretaries of Delegation
DESTINATION	Ponta Delgada, The Azores, Portugal
DATES	April 1-2, 2011
DELEGATION	
SENATE	Senator Raynell Andreychuk, Senator Jane Cordy, Senator Joseph A. Day Senator Pierre Claude Nolin
HOUSE OF COMMONS	
STAFF	Mr. James Latimer, Association Secretary
TRANSPORTATION	\$72,471.85
ACCOMMODATION	\$2,930.82
HOSPITALITY	\$0.00
PER DIEMS	\$2,184.51
OFFICIAL GIFTS	\$0.00
MISCELLANEOUS / REGISTRATION FEES	\$0.00
TOTAL	\$77,587.18