

**NATO, EU AND THE NEW RISKS:
A SOUTHEAST EUROPE PERSPECTIVE**

29-30 October 2004

Sofia, Bulgaria

The present publication summarizes the discussions at the international conference “*NATO, EU and the New Risks: A Southeast Europe Perspective*” held on October 29-30, 2004 in Sofia, Bulgaria. The conference’s discussions benefited from the participation of NATO’s Deputy Secretary General, Ambassador Alessandro Minuto Rizzo, Bulgarian Deputy Prime Minister Plamen Panayotov, Bulgaria’s Minister of Defense, Nikolai Svinarov, senior government officials from Southeast Europe (SEE) and West European countries - representatives of international organizations and aid agencies, diplomatic missions, academic institutions, and non-governmental organizations. The 2004 conference was a continuation of the high level event “*Shaping a Common Security Agenda for Southeast Europe: New Approaches and Shared Responsibilities*”, held in September 2003 in Sofia with the participation of NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson and Bulgarian and SEE officials, including 8 ministers of defense and the interior.

Recognized as a NATO Flagship Event, the conference aimed to generate further debate on the security situation in Southeast Europe, especially in the Western Balkans, and to emphasize the importance of continued involvement of the international community and its leading organizations like NATO and the EU, as they enlarge. Among the main objectives of the conference were to promote further political, professional and academic debate, on the broader issues of defense and security forces transformation.

Center for the Study of Democracy
5, Alexander Zhendov str., 1113 Sofia
Tel. (+359 2) 971 3000
Fax: (+359 2) 971 2233
csd@online.bg
www.csd.bg

CONTENTS

THE ORGANIZER	5
AGENDA.....	7
CONFERENCE REPORT.....	17
SPEECHES	35
MEDIA COVERAGE	75
CONFERENCE PHOTOGRAPHS.....	81
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	87

THE ORGANIZER



Founded in late 1989, the Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD) is an interdisciplinary public policy institute dedicated to the values of democracy and market economy. The Center achieves its objectives through policy research, process monitoring, drafting of legislation, dissemination and advocacy activities and building partnerships, local and international networks.

In the last five years CSD has focused its efforts on the linkages between a more traditional rule of law agenda and the newly emerging threats to both security and development in Bulgaria and Southeast Europe. Among these, smuggling and the international operations of organized crime pose one of the most serious threats to security and prosperity in the region and thus warrant the attention of a wider community of stakeholders. Thus CSD has been promoting the establishment of public-private partnerships in this area both in Bulgaria and internationally. Its pioneering studies of the role of corruption in the trafficking of commercial goods in Bulgaria have brought about changes in government policies increasing the effectiveness of law enforcement. Applied for a third year in Bulgaria, this method allows policy makers to identify weak spots in border controls and design responses that target the latest developments in the techniques used by organized crime. In addition to its policy analysis and recommendations work – which of late includes the mechanisms through which organized crime has impacted on the reform of the security services in Southeast Europe – CSD is providing training assistance to the government in enhancing the anti-corruption capacity in the security sector.

With the support of:

Public Diplomacy Division of NATO

Government of Norway

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria

Ministry of Defense of Bulgaria

Ministry of Interior of Bulgaria

Arcus Co.

Kremikovtzi AD

Kintex

AGENDA

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY CONFERENCE

**NATO, EU AND THE NEW RISKS:
A SOUTHEAST EUROPE PERSPECTIVE**

29-30 October 2004

Boyana Conference Center
Sofia, Bulgaria

Thursday, October 28

**Arrivals
Registration**

19.30

**Reception hosted by Deputy Prime
Minister Plamen Panayotov**

Friday, October 29

09.00

Opening



Dr. Ognian Shentov
Chairman, Center for the Study of Democracy

09.15

First panel: NATO's contribution to stability and security and the new challenges. EU's new role in SEE security _____



Mr. Plamen Panayotov
Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria



Ambassador Alessandro Minuto Rizzo
Deputy Secretary General, NATO



Mr. Nikolay Svinarov
Minister of Defense of Bulgaria



Mr. Dominick Chilcott
Director, EU Policy, UK Foreign Office



Panel Chair:
Ambassador Boyko Noev
Director, European Program
Center for the Study of Democracy

10.10- 10.30

Discussion

10.30- 11.00

Coffee break

11.00-12.30

First panel (continued)



Ambassador Michael Sahlin
EU Special Representative in Macedonia



Mr. Mate Raboteg
State Secretary, Ministry of Defense of Croatia



Ambassador Lubomir Ivanov
Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to NATO



Panel Chair:

Dr. Emil Tsenkov

Director, Information Centre on
the Council of Europe

12.00- 12.30

Discussion

13.00

Lunch hosted by Mr. Nikolay Svinarov

Minister of Defense of Bulgaria

14.30

**Second panel: New security risks, inter-agency co-operation. Security sector
and defense transformation** _____



Mr. Dragan Djurović

Deputy Prime Minister and
Minister of the Interior of Montenegro



Lieut. Gen. Atanas Zaprianov

Deputy-Chief of the Bulgarian General Staff



Mr. Dragan Jočić

Minister of the Interior of Serbia



Panel Chair:
Lieut.Gen. (ret.) Chavdar Chervenkov
Senior Expert, Center for the Study of Democracy

15.15-15.45

Discussion

15.45-16.15

Coffee break

16.15-18.00

Second panel (continued)



Professor Georgi Petkanov
Minister of the Interior of Bulgaria



Dr. Vlado Buchkovski
Minister of Defense of Macedonia



Maj. Gen. Holger Sammet
Assistant Director
Planning and Policy Division
NATO International Military Secretariat



Mr. Zamfir Geanta
Deputy Chief of the General
Inspectorate of the Border Police, Romania



Panel Chair:
Colonel Valeri Ratchev
Deputy Commandant
Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria

17.30- 18.00

Discussion

20.00

**Reception hosted by the Mayor of Sofia
Stefan Sofiyanski**

Saturday, October 30

09.30

Third panel: Public-private partnerships in tackling the new risks _____



Ms. Elizabeth Pond
Editor, Transatlantic Internationale Politik



Dr. Dimitar Yonchev
Chairman, Balkan Security Forum



Lieut. Gen. (ret.) Anju Angelov
Chairman, Center for the Study of
National Security



Panel Chair:
Ambassador Boyko Kotzev
Deputy Minister of Interior, Bulgaria

11.30- 12.00

Discussion

12.00

Closing remarks



Professor Georgi Petkanov
Minister of the Interior of Bulgaria

13.00

Lunch hosted by Interior
Minister Georgi Petkanov

CONFERENCE REPORT

OPENING REMARKS

The **Second International Conference NATO, EU and the New Risks: a Southeast Europe Perspective** was opened by CSD Chairman, Dr. Ognian Shentov. He commented that the acceptance of Romania and Bulgaria in NATO and the prospect of EU membership in 2007 clearly contributed to the broadening zone of democratic peace and economic stability. Dr. Shentov highlighted the fact that the new security threats call for innovative responses that go beyond the solutions provided by traditional institutional mechanisms. In his opinion, the **public-private partnership** format, involving non-governmental organizations and governments was a step in this direction. He asserted that in the public sector, there was need for better cooperation and communication between the specialized and independent institutions, such as the defense and interior ministries. Mr. Shentov added that **the inadequacy of national solutions to global challenges imposed the need for new institutional thinking, such as the one endorsed by organizations like NATO.**

In addition, Dr. Shentov noted that it had become clear that international terrorism could not be limited by military means only. The lessons learned showed that a broader approach was needed: an approach that balanced between all available political, economic, or international legal instruments that would confine the social base of terrorism.

Dr. Shentov also emphasized the links between terrorism and organized crime. He stated that **organized crime in the Balkans is a threat not only to personal security but also to the stability of democratic institutions and the success of economic reforms.** He added that the informal economy constitutes 20% to 40% of the GDP in the SEE countries, fueling corruption and sustaining organized crime. Revenues from the informal economy, Dr. Shentov explained, were often invested in legal enterprises, thus blurring the line between formal and informal economy. He added that the large grey-economic sector and the widespread nepotism and corruption often left the participants in the grey economy untouched by law-enforcement, and impeded the reform of the security sector in Southeastern Europe.

The security challenges that we face today should be addressed by going beyond the traditionally closed mechanism by which security agencies develop strategies and concepts. Governments should encourage the fusion of ideas created through public-private partnerships.

Dr. Ognian Shentov

Dr. Shentov pointed that analysis and research of the grey economy by institutions, such as CSD, changed the traditional governmental assessment of the threat of organized crime. Nevertheless stronger instruments were needed to break the bond between authority and organized crime. Dr. Shentov called for a common Southeast European strategy for countering corruption and organized crime that would take

into account EU's priorities in this field. He concluded by stating that success can be reached only with the joint efforts of governments, international organizations such as NATO and the EU, the private sector, and the civil society.

FIRST PANEL: NATO'S CONTRIBUTION TO STABILITY AND SECURITY AND THE NEW CHALLENGES. EU'S NEW ROLE IN SEE SECURITY

The goal of this session was to discuss NATO's role in tackling the threats that SEE faces: ethnic tensions, organized crime and corruption. The participants discussed NATO's transformation as well as its new missions, and its changing role as a security guarantor of SEE.

The first part of this panel brought together Mr. Plamen Panayotov, Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria, Ambassador Alessandro Minuto Rizzo, Deputy Secretary General of NATO, Mr. Nikolay Svinarov, Minister of Defense of Bulgaria and Mr. Dominick Chilcott, EU Policy Director at the UK Foreign Office. The discussion was moderated by Ambassador Boyko Noev, Director of the European Program of the Center for the Study of Democracy. In the second panel, participants included Ambassador Michael Sahlin, EU Special Representative in Macedonia, Mr. Mate Raboteg, State Secretary, Ministry of Defense of Croatia and Ambassador Lubomir Ivanov, Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to NATO. Their discussion was moderated by Dr. Emil Tsenkov, Director of the Information Centre on the Council of Europe.

Mr. Plamen Panayotov, Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria identified terrorism and weapons of mass destruction as threats of the new millennium but noted that corruption and organized crime were the major threats for SEE. He explained the interconnection and interdependence of such threats stating that **“terrorism finds a social base in places where poverty and chaos prevail and organized criminal activities often form the financial backbone of terrorism”**. In that respect, the regional challenges should not be viewed only as a threat to the Euro-Atlantic integration of the Western Balkans. **Finding a solution to these regional challenges would in fact also reduce the global threat of terrorism.**

Mr. Panayotov praised NATO's stabilizing role in the Balkans, particularly in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Macedonia. He reminded the audience that at the Istanbul summit NATO asserted strategic importance of the Balkans and reaffirmed the organization's central importance in improving the security and stability of SEE.

Mr. Panayotov noted NATO's changing role in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the incoming EU operation “Altea”. He explained that NATO's presence was to be reduced to 150 staff in Sarajevo's headquarters, while operation “Altea” would employ the so called Berlin Plus mechanisms, which ensured the use of NATO forces and support. In Kosovo, NATO's presence would continue into 2005 along with continuing US presence. Keeping in mind NATO's stabilizing role in the region, Mr. Panayotov called for a clear timeline for the integration of Albania, Macedonia, and Croatia into the Alliance. He added that the inclusion of Serbia and Montenegro, and Bosnia and Herzegovina through the Partnership for Peace agreements would not only benefit them domestically, but would be an investment in the security and welfare of all of Southeast Europe. Mr. Panayotov also noted NATO membership role in drawing foreign investment, pointing to the significant increase in Bulgaria since the membership invitation was first announced in November 2002.

Mr. Panayotov turned to the other “strategic partner” of Southeast Europe, the European Union. He pointed to EU’s integration policies and missions in the Western Balkans as instrumental in the regional transition to peace, democracy and stability. He emphasized the positive role of the Process of Stabilization and Association for SEE countries and EU cooperation with NATO, exemplified by the *NATO and EU Concerted Approach for the Western Balkans*, accepted in July 2003.

Mr. Panayotov’s final remarks concerned NATO and EU roles in unifying the Balkans. He stated that NATO and EU are continually sending the message that the road to membership passes through cooperation. The regional cooperation efforts were supported by Greece and Turkey, and the EU provided the financial support for their implementation.

In his keynote speech, **Ambassador Alessandro Minuto Rizzo, Deputy Secretary General of NATO**, discussed the changing role of NATO. He noted the alliance’s increased presence in Afghanistan and its role in Iraq in assisting Iraqi security forces. He stated that NATO had to move “beyond being a purely “Eurocentric” Alliance” so that it could tackle the terrorist threats and the threats from failed states.

Ambassador Rizzo emphasized that the political transformation needs to be accompanied by a military transformation. He noted that the new missions required new capabilities, both to allow for a more rapid response to crises, as well as for long-term peace support operations. The NATO Response Force had already achieved its initial operational capability. The next step was to sustain NRF missions by reforming force planning and force generation procedures in line with political ambitions.

Ambassador Rizzo added that alongside NATO’s efforts to improve capabilities, another feature of the new approach to security was developing stronger partnerships. He explained that the South East Europe Initiative promoted greater regional security cooperation among all countries from the region, including those that did not have any institutionalized ties with NATO. In addition, the Membership Action Plan and Partnership for Peace program helped in guiding Bulgaria, Romania and Slovenia’s preparations for their recent accession to NATO. Defense reform and associated improvements in security institutions were evident in all countries of the region. Military capabilities were being transformed to forces that would have greater utility in crisis management and peacekeeping. Ambassador Rizzo noted that the NATO-led mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina would be handed over to the EU. He stressed that this did not end NATO’s presence and assistance with the defense reforms in the country, because NATO’s goal was to bring Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Serbia and Montenegro, into the Partnership for Peace program in due course.

*“Security and stability in South East Europe is also challenged by **organized crime, corruption, illegal migration, human trafficking and the unlawful trade in small arms**. It is essential that the rule of law be strengthened. The police forces must be made more accountable and the judiciary must be seen to be both robust and independent.”*

*Ambassador
Alessandro Rizzo*

Ambassador Rizzo also remarked that there remained a number of challenges, most notably safeguarding a stable and multi-ethnic Kosovo. Another challenge, facing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, was the issue of decentralisation, which was the cornerstone of the Ohrid Agreement and “an essential element to ensure the integration of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in the Euro-Atlantic institutions.” **Organized crime, corruption, illegal migration, human trafficking and the unlawful trade in small arms were some other challenges that have the potential to weaken governments.** Making the police forces more accountable, the judiciary more robust and independent and improving border security were some of the measures, according to Ambassador Rizzo, that needed to be taken. Ambassador Rizzo emphasized that border security was a serious challenge. NATO had addressed this challenge by supporting the Ohrid Border Process launched in May 2003 and the follow-up of the process, discussed during the Second Review Conference, in Tirana.

Ambassador Rizzo concluded by highlighting the alliance’s close cooperation with the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe as well as the strategic partnership with the EU. He added that the concerted approach on security in Southeastern Europe, exemplified by the Stability Pact and NATO’s Partnership for Peace program, has been instrumental in stabilizing the region.

Mr. Nikolay Svinarov, Minister of Defense of Bulgaria, acknowledged that the process of globalization had been conducive for expansion of areas of cooperation, intensification of interstate relations and increase in trust. However, globalization and the openness of countries have made them more vulnerable to the asymmetric threats to security. These threats increased the willingness to create areas of common interests and responsibilities that relate to the preservation and strengthening of peace and security. Mr. Svinarov observed that the states in Southeastern Europe faced similar problems. Organized crime had ignored international and interethnic differences and had used the positive effects of globalization to its advantage. He explained that major channels for trafficking of drugs, people and weapons passed through the Balkans. Mr. Svinarov argued that the geopolitical situation of the Balkans and its ethnic, religious and cultural differences should be seen not only as a challenge but as an advantage and an opportunity to solve security problems.

NATO and EU membership gives Southeast European states prospects and opportunities to achieve and secure regional peace but also to contribute to the shared efforts of member-states to achieve peace, stability and prosperity. Mr. Svinarov emphasized that these European and Euro Atlantic prospects transform the economic and investment environment of the region. This relationship works both ways- investments can also be a factor in guaranteeing stability and prosperity for the state, its business sector and society in general. At the same time, preparation for membership requires massive transformation in all spheres and change in the security strategy.

Bulgaria supports the “open door” policy of NATO that was confirmed at the NATO summit in Istanbul. **The integration of Southeast European states in NATO is a priority of Bulgaria’s foreign policy which has gained wide political and public support.** Bulgaria supports candidate countries on their road to NATO membership

and the association of Serbia and Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina through “Partnership for Peace”.

Mr. Svinarov concluded with the observation that states in the Western Balkans have important opportunities for politico-military cooperation, which needs to be strengthened by seeking solutions at the practical level. Bulgaria would support specific initiatives such as summits and expert meetings, trainings, development of the military, economic and technical cooperation and information exchange. Bulgaria can share its experience in preparing for NATO and EU membership and in defense planning, staff training and creating the necessary normative base for military and security developments.

Mr. Dominick Chilcott, Director of EU Policy in the UK Foreign Office, expanded more on the European Union’s contribution to dealing with the security threats. Mr. Chilcott broadly divided security threats in the region into three categories. One was the classic state aggression, which he believed has become rarer but remains a worry in some areas such as the southern part of Cyprus. Security threats of the second category are consequences of state failure or bad governance and include organized crime, legal immigration, people trafficking, drugs trafficking and the spread of disease. The third security threat, which is not specific to Southeastern Europe, is the threat of international terrorism.

Mr. Chilcott discussed responses to these security threats. The most effective response to the possibility of state aggression is to join credible and strong alliance committed to collective defense. State failure itself has two categories. The first issue is the unrest, instability, conflict and humanitarian crisis, which NATO has successfully intervened to deal with in different parts of the Western Balkans and also in Afghanistan and Iraq. The great advantage that the European Union has in addressing these challenges is its comprehensive package of policies that it can apply in a country. The EU can deploy peacekeeping troops, civilian police, humanitarian and reconstruction aids, technical assistance and budgets for training; the European Union has very powerful trade measures, negative and positive, and can use the diplomatic pressure from 25 plus member states coordinating a common policy.

Mr. Chilcott noted that in all of these the strategic partnership of the EU and NATO is a very exciting prospect for cooperation in the region. Once the immediate crisis has been stabilized, comes the second phase of state failure, the failure of the administration to administer, the breakdown in the rule of law, leading to criminality, corruption, trafficking and in general impoverishment of the country. Here, internal measures ensuring robust and independent judiciary, an accountable police force and functioning mechanisms to enforce judgments are required. **Because criminal activities do not respect international boundaries, all European countries have an interest in every other European country’s capacity and will to enforce the rule of law.**

Mr. Chilcott, pointed out that the most powerful weapon in the European Union’s armory in encouraging governments to establish, enforce and implement the rule of law is the enlargement policy and offering the prospect of membership. The record of enlargement provides evidence that this response has been successful. Mr. Chilcott stated that in the former Yugoslavia, progress is more mixed but the prospect of

membership is a factor for the efforts that Bosnia, Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, and Albania are clearly making.

Finally, Mr. Chilcott highlighted that policy makers, think-tankers and journalists among others are all responsible to respond to the threat of international terrorism without spreading fear and terror amongst communities for this is the terrorists' objective. **There is more that the countries in the international community can and should be doing collectively to combat the threat from international terrorism whether it's in the sphere of information and intelligence sharing or whether it's in adopting sufficiently rigorous legislation, without abusing individual freedoms and liberties.**

Ambassador Boyko Noev, Director of CSD's European Program, remarked that both EU and NATO enlargements are **at the heart of a single process, leading to consolidation of democracy and market economy across the wider, and yet undefined boundaries of Europe.** One of the strongest arguments in favor of the "open door" policy is the already discussed belief that the prospect of membership is a strong incentive for internal change. The broader political approach to the "open door" policy could be instrumental in solving the remaining problems in the Western Balkans but not without rethinking and refining the policy. Clear perspectives, achievable in reasonably short time and specific "conditions" to be met are needed. For instance, a close perspective and date for EU membership to include Serbia and Kosovo in exchange for fast solutions on the so called "final status" would increase public pressure for compromise on the political elites. Ambassador Noev shared his opinion that a bolder and more assertive approach to finding "final" solutions across the Western Balkans is needed.

Ambassador Michael Sahlin, EU Special Representative in Macedonia, added to the discussion the perspective of Macedonia, a former republic of Yugoslavia which is struggling with a complex past filled with lots of wars, lots of questions of identity arising from those conflicts and that is now heavily supported in its aspiration for EU and NATO membership. The conflict in 2001 broke out in a country that had been seen as an example of peaceful coexistence in the wider region marked by violent conflicts. Nonetheless, in that country it was seen to be useful just in case to have the UNPREDEP seen at the time as the example of successful conflict prevention mission. Ambassador Sahlin reminded that the conflict in 2001 sparked an intense effort by the international community to prevent that conflict from becoming a large-scaled bloody civil war. That effort culminated in the summer 2001, in August of that year, in the signing of the OHRID Framework Agreement, but continues today to ensure long-term stability and economic development. Ambassador Sahlin underlined that Macedonia's road to Euro-Atlantic integration and a better future goes through the full implementation of the accord, signed that summer. This case proves that firm international commitment, coherence and engagement are essential to making the international communities' peace and reconciliation efforts successful. The EU has shown its long term commitment in Macedonia and has complemented, not competed with NATO in its work.

Ambassador Sahlin explained that the police mission, Proxima, an innovation in the development of the ESDP, represents the overall transition in the support of the EU

from open crisis management, military, shuttle diplomacy, military for stabilization, then civilian and more general aid, especially accession support. **The point of this protracted, sustained and firm commitment is to bridge the gap between direct crisis management, military, civilian and to the rapprochement to European structures and thereby to ensure stability and progress.**

Ambassador Sahlin pointed out three things that have to be done after the conflict stage in order to pave the way for the much needed and much asked for economic progress in the country: stabilization of the security situation, full implementation of the peace agreement and structural reforms of the judiciary, the labor market, public sectors, etc., that will create an environment inviting for investments. In conclusion, Ambassador Sahlin expressed his belief that from an EU perspective **successful crisis-management requires a firm commitment, close partnership with other international actors, where complementarity is the essential ingredient, and then thirdly, a clear prospective for the future.**

Mr. Mate Raboteg, State Secretary for Defense in the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Croatia, observed that by active engagement of NATO and the EU, significant steps have been made towards stabilization of Southeastern Europe. Mr. Raboteg commented that the transfer of mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina from NATO to EU, within the framework of the «Berlin +» arrangement, marked a new step in further stabilization.

SEE states have begun to redefine their security concepts by reassessing their security environment and shifting their focus more on transnational threats. Mr. Raboteg believes that the response to these threats needs to contribute to the establishment of such government institutions in the countries of the region that will be able to face present day threats and that will cooperate with each other. **Instabilities, which still exist in Southeastern Europe have emerged as the product of conflicts during the 1990's and the enduring transition process, that is, economic hardship.** As far as asymmetric threats and risks are concerned, the most effective response to them, according to Mr. Raboteg, is the membership in NATO and the European Union. One way in which this is manifested is that the prospect of Alliance membership gives Croatia additional impetus to defense reform efforts. **An effective response to security threats requires full cooperation of the countries in the region with the Hague Tribunal, and the fulfillment of assumed commitments.**

Mr. Raboteg pointed to the cooperation of Croatia, Albania, and Macedonia, with the support of USA in the framework of US-Adriatic Charter (A-3) as a good example of regional cooperation. Besides other politico-military activities, in progress is the design of operational-technical details for forming a combined Albanian-Croatian-Macedonian military medical team to be engaged in NATO-led operations. Furthermore, Mr. Raboteg observed that the Republic of Croatia actively participates in the work of different regional initiative forums related to Central and South East Europe (Stability Pact, SEDM, CENCOOP, Quadrilateral Initiative and SEEI). The Republic of Croatia also participates in the ISAF mission in Afghanistan, supporting the activities of the Antiterrorist Coalition. Mr. Raboteg finally commented that **“Croatia sees the future of Southeastern Europe only in complete integration of all countries in the region into the Euro-Atlantic security association”.**

Ambassador Lubomir Ivanov, Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to NATO, opened his discourse with the observation that some of the security risks that are being discussed in the conference have existed before but are considered new because now they are more noticeable and acknowledged by international organizations. The European Union and NATO have started to think and act in a systematic way as seen by the development of the ESDP, EU commitment to operations in the region, the transformation of the Alliance, the training of Iraqi security forces and the operation in Afghanistan and new activities in Kosovo.

Mr. Ivanov expanded on the collective defense mechanism of NATO that has functioned well in the past but is not as relevant to the present. In contrast, the decision-making process in the Alliance needs continual commitment, political will and transparency. All of these, naturally, need to be based on adequate capabilities. The quality and the utility of these capabilities are important. Secondly, Mr. Ivanov commented that separate countries need to work on specific tasks and have concrete responsibilities that may at times overlap. In addition, coordination is important as efforts need to answer collective needs but also relate to activities at the national level. In all this, prioritizing in resource allocation is a key moment. A relevant concept that is being discussed is the idea of common financing that is supported by Bulgarian and many other countries. **This type of financing will cover a wider range of common activities and thus narrow the gap between objectives that have been set and the financial ability to reach these objectives.** However, Mr. Ivanov made it clear that common financing cannot and should not replace national contributions.

Mr. Ivanov continued with the roles of EU and NATO in Southeastern Europe, remarking that these should not be the same but should complement each other. The European Union will share some of NATO's principles and capabilities within the framework of the "Berlin +" arrangement, but can contribute with an armory of different crisis management measures. **In developing its specific mechanisms and using those in its European Security and Defense Policy, the European Union should include candidate countries such as Bulgaria with a clear perspective for membership.**

Finally, **Mr. Ivanov underlined that Southeastern Europe's importance in the context of the new security risks lies in the fact that the region serves as a test for NATO and the EU.** It is true that Afghanistan is a test for what NATO can do. However, Mr. Ivanov stated that Southeastern Europe provides just as important opportunities for assessment, because it presents a full range of challenges, from enlargement and its prospects to immediate crisis management and following stabilization efforts. That is why, NATO and the European Union should have an increasing role and commitment to the problems in Southeastern Europe.

SECOND PANEL: NEW SECURITY RISKS, INTER-AGENCY CO-OPERATION. SECURITY SECTOR AND DEFENSE TRANSFORMATION

The purpose of the second panel was to start a discussion between representatives of different security agencies, such as ministries of defense and interior, on the ways they cooperate to tackle new security threats. The participants discussed the various mechanisms of cooperation between agencies and with international actors, such as NATO and the EU.

In the first part of the panel, participants included Mr. Dragan Djurović, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior of Montenegro, Lieut. Gen. Atanas Zaprianov, Deputy-Chief of the Bulgarian General Staff and Mr. Dragan Jočić, Minister of the Interior of Serbia. The discussion was moderated by Lieut. Gen. (ret.) Chavdar Chervenkov, Senior Expert at the Center for the Study of Democracy. In the second part of the panel the discussants were Prof. Georgi Petkanov, Minister of the Interior of Bulgaria, Dr. Vlado Buchkovski, Minister of Defense of Macedonia, Maj. General Holger Sammet, Assistant Director IMS NATO, Planning and Policy and Mr. Zamfir Geanta, Deputy Director, General Inspectorate, Border Police of Romania. The discussion was moderated by Colonel Valeri Ratchev, Deputy Commandant of the Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria.

Mr. Dragan Djurović, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Interior of Montenegro, asserted that **contrary to the cold-war period security threats today are constantly changing, require “soft” measures, a more systematic approach and long-term solutions to problems.** Within the context of transformation of threats, the means and priorities of the key European and Euro-Atlantic security structures have also changed. Mr. Djurović commented that **“if once the priority of NATO was Cold War, today its priority is definitely “hot-peace”.** In addition, NATO changed its traditional focus on Europe by employing its forces outside the Old Continent's borders. What is particularly important is that NATO continued to spread further to the East by admitting seven East European countries. NATO and Russia established new partnership in the form of NATO-Russia Council, and the NATO-Ukraine Council, as well as the Mediterranean Dialog, were established.

Mr. Djurović explained that Montenegro fully welcomes immediate and unconditional fulfilling of all requests put before Serbia and Montenegro in order to join Partnership for Peace and NATO. He agreed that it was necessary to fully cooperate with the Hague Tribunal, without any reservation or postponing. Croatia's readiness to cooperate comes from the understanding of the advantages of NATO membership. Mr. Djurović listed increased security, contribution to the stability within the region, improved and better organized military forces as some of them.

Mr. Djurović pointed out that the EU, on the other hand significantly developed its security and defense policy. Important steps have been made so far in establishing of rapid reaction forces, and the EU will also have autonomous capacity for military planning. By developing the ESDP, the EU is not competing with NATO, but complementing it. **Bearing in mind the unpredictable and mobile character of the security threats today “there is enough room for both NATO and ESDP within the region of Southeastern Europe”, where mutual cooperation is of key**

importance. Mr. Djurović identified terrorism as the biggest security threat. The responses of Montenegro to security threats include development of modern and competent police forces, setting up Coast Guard to secure the so-called “blue border” on Adriatic Sea and Skadar Lake, drafting and adopting a Strategy of National Security and modernization and full civilian control over the Army.

Lieut. Gen. Atanas Zaprianov, Deputy-Chief of the Bulgarian General Staff, gave a presentation on the Bulgarian Armed Forces in transformation. Lieut. Gen. Zaprianov listed the following factors as influential to security and stability: international terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, asymmetric risks and threats, different level of democratization, Islamic fundamentalism, refugees problems and interethnic conflicts. Gen. Zaprianov pointed out that **“in regional and global security and stability area, the Republic of Bulgaria makes integrated political, economic and military-political endeavors to achieve maximum effectiveness of its activities.”** The future functional structure of the Bulgarian Armed Forces is comprised of active forces and support elements, the active forces including deployable forces and forces provided to NATO such as immediate action and response forces.

Mr. Dragan Jočić, Minister of the Interior of Serbia, commented that an effective response to security threats such as terrorism, organized crime and border security, requires the creation of organizational units in the Ministries and Police structures. That is why reform of the Police Forces as part of broader reform efforts is a priority of the Ministry of the Interior of Serbia. In addition, Serbia tries to cooperate with its Southeast European partners and with international institutions. These efforts stem from the understanding that the **regional partners need to define a common framework for dealing with security challenges that will contribute to peace and security and make possible a faster integration of these countries into the European Union.**

Prof. Georgi Petkanov, Minister of the Interior of Bulgaria, explained that Bulgaria has taken some concrete measures to counter the changing security environment. The National Security Service has been reorganized using the model of similar structures in NATO member countries. There have also been some legislative changes. Prof. Petkanov identified some of the security challenges facing Bulgaria: organized crime, illegal trafficking, terrorism and spread of weapons of mass destruction. **The Ministry of Interior of Bulgaria has directed its efforts towards cooperation with the EU and NATO, building of adequate administrative capacity, coordination with the Special Services, the Police, with the Judiciary and local administrative structures.** Prof. Petkanov noted that the exchange of information should be improved to ensure the effectiveness of prevention measures. According to him, the new security risks can be controlled only through integration of the police and special services functions in the European and Euro-Atlantic Structures.

Dr. Vlado Buchkovski, Minister of Defense of the Republic of Macedonia, characterized the time of the conference as dominated by positive integration initiatives but also as time of real challenges and asymmetric threats to security. All states in the region face possible manifestation of extreme nationalism, racial intolerance, religious hatred, international terrorism, organized crime, illicit migration of all kind, insufficiently secured and safe borders. No state is immune to transitional problems as: corruption,

urban terrorism, economic crime and tax evasion. In addition, states face the consequences from the collision of interests on utilization of sources catastrophes, damaging computer crime and destruction of the natural environment. States cannot combat these threats alone so in defending their own interests, they should also contribute to regional and global peace and stability.

Dr. Buchkovski explored the global activities that the Republic of Macedonia has assumed in regard to NATO, active involvement in the antiterrorist coalition and considering the areas of possible participation in the defense capabilities of the Alliance and the region. The Republic of Macedonia participates in the Iraqi Freedom mission with one special units platoon and is part of the ISAF mission in Afghanistan by continuing its participation with an enhanced army detachment.

Major General Holger Sammet, Assistant Director in the Planning and Policy Division, NATO International Military Secretariat, spoke on behalf of himself and not as a representative of NATO. Maj. General Sammet first spoke on the role of NATO, which he stressed was not a military organization portrayed by the fact that from the approximately 483 committees that support the NATO Council only one is military. In addition, in contrast with the European Union, NATO is not a supranational organization and is governed by three rules, which Gen. Sammet simplified as one man-one vote, unanimous vote and nothing has been agreed until everything is agreed. Gen. Sammet characterized NATO as a political organization with a military aspect that has an essential role in the security area in maintaining the vital link with the United States.

Maj. Gen. Sammet then presented the aspects of security policy according to the two traditional schools of thoughts. The first one puts security policy in the foreign policy arena where governments worry primarily about threats from abroad. The second school views security as a domestic issue. **Maj. Gen. Sammet deemed both schools incomplete and explained that security is a continuum and security policy cuts across all fields of traditional policy, ranging from the physical security of the citizens of a state to social security and security in the foreign policy.** Maj. Gen. Sammet observed that the military is only one means in addressing security challenges. The military must be capable to understand broader problems and has to cooperate at many different levels. Gen. Sammet advised that a state should let its military participate in international activities and underlined the importance of teaching the military in a democracy and pluralistic society to lobby itself.

Maj. Gen. Sammet pointed out that the EU is usually perceived as economic organization. However, it was based on security aspects and it has never lost them. The EU is about overcoming the divides in Europe and it has all the tools necessary for that. As seen in the functions of the Parliament and the Commission, the EU has a supranational aspect. Gen. Sammet concluded that both NATO and the EU are in the process of constant reform, but both are sources of stability. Each state needs to have a military capable of serving under NATO or EU umbrella.

Mr. Zamfir Geanta, Deputy Director of the General Inspectorate of the Border Police in Romania, expanded on the role of the Border Police in preventing external and internal risk factors that may affect security. Mr. Geanta reported that **the**

Romanian Border Police has strengthened its structure, achieved institutional and operational improvements, improved statistics gathering and anticorruption efforts.

THIRD PANEL: PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN TACKLING THE NEW RISKS

The goal of the third panel was to discuss the processes and the mechanisms through which private institutions and government agencies could cooperate in analyzing, researching and involving the public in tackling non-traditional threats to security. The panel participants agreed that **partnerships between non-government organizations, researchers, the media and governments are important both at the national and regional levels**. In addition, some shared the belief that NGOs in Bulgaria have the necessary experience to participate in the process of defining new security risks.

Participants included Ms. Elizabeth Pond, Editor in the Transatlantic Internationale Politik, Dr. Dimitar Yonchev, Chairman of the Balkan Security Forum, and Lieut. Gen. (ret.) Anyu Angelov, Chairman of the Center for the Study of National Security. The discussion was moderated by Mr. Boyko Kotzev, Deputy Minister of Interior, Bulgaria.

Mr. Boyko Kotzev, Deputy Minister of Interior of Bulgaria, started the discussion by commenting that the civil society and the media have become trust-worthy partners in the fight against organized crime, corruption and even terrorism. Mr. Kotzev identified the cooperation of the government and non-government organizations in the context of an anticorruption twinning project as a concrete example. **He also proposed the idea for the creation of a National Council for Prevention of Crime that can unite efforts with the Center for the Study of Democracy**. This council can coordinate efforts of the government, local representatives, NGOs and the business sector, and can contribute to a better decision-making process in regards to the new security risks.

Ms. Elizabeth Pond, Editor of Transatlantic Internationale Politik, a magazine published by the German Council on International Relations, supported the idea that **the partnership with non-government organizations is beneficial because of the nonconventional ideas that come from this sector**. Governments are more limited in defining long-term problems and objectives because they focus efforts on daily troubles and immediate crises. One participant in a good public-private partnership that Ms. Pond identified was the Center for the Study of Democracy. Ms. Pond commented that **CSD's analyses were among the most valuable on the Balkans as they provide insight into the economic effects of the new security risks**. Ms. Pond also discussed the crisis in the transatlantic relations which requires solutions based on innovative ideas and approaches.

Dr. Dimitar Yonchev, Chairman of the Balkan Security Forum, discussed the state of the "nonhomogenous" security sector in Bulgaria. In his opinion, Bulgaria lacks a strong security system and one of the reasons he identified is the concentration of efforts on NATO membership resulting in less attention paid to personal security. Another reason is the absence of horizontal networks in the society that are based on cooperation to reach a common objective. To solve this problem, Dr. Yonchev proposed the creation of operational centers that can respond to different levels of security by employing measures depending on concrete needs. These horizontal centers can also

be coordinated vertically to ensure adequacy of resources in managing crises.

Lieut. Gen. Anyu Angelov, Chairman of the Center for the Study of National Security, provided a different perspective on public-private partnerships. He stressed that the normative base concerning nongovernmental organizations has considerable faults and does not treat all such organizations in the same way. The participation of these institutions in the creation of a National Security Strategy is important. In addition, Mr. Angelov proposed the organization of a coalition of nongovernmental organizations that focus on security in Southeastern Europe.

In response to Mr. Angelov's statement, Ms. Tatayana Doncheva, a Member of the Parliament and one of the authors of the Law on Non-Profit Organizations, explained that the act is not discriminatory but gives nongovernmental institutions that are financially limited a chance to function.

Dr. Ognian Shentov, Chairman of the Center for the Study of Democracy, commented that public-private partnerships need to be carefully considered because of the real danger that the objectives of a political party become objectives of the nongovernmental organization. These last institutions need to participate in policy making but at the same time remain independent. Dr. Shentov confirmed the importance of the economic analysis of the new risks and supported the utilization of social networks in the fight against organized crime. He concluded with the observation that in a period of transition the public-private partnership is the most appropriate form of cooperation.

Mr. Boyko Todorov, Program Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy, gave a specific example that proved the advances of the public-private partnership in Bulgaria. He noted that **the conference itself is organized by a nongovernmental organization in cooperation with governmental institutions and business enterprises.** He raised the question of the criteria used when identifying security problems and concluded that in general these stem from the breakdown in the rule of law and governance.

SPEECHES



Dr. Ognian Shentov
Chairman, Center for the Study of Democracy

*Mr. Deputy-Secretary General,
Mr. Deputy Prime Minister,
Ministers and Ambassadors,
Ladies and Gentlemen,*

It is a pleasure to welcome you to the second conference devoted to the security of Southeast Europe. I would like to note with pleasure that this time Romania and Bulgaria attend in their new capacity as representatives of NATO member states. The European Union has already announced an accession date for these two countries. Both developments are a sign of the real prospects of the Euro-Atlantic integration of Southeast Europe, and the forthcoming extension of the zone of democracy, stability, and economic prosperity.

Today's conference continues the discussions and the dialogue with a focus on the new challenges and risks to international security. We are all convinced that following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 in the US and on March 11, 2004 in Europe, the world faces threats that could be countered only through new ways of thinking and cooperating. In this respect, one of the most important advantages of the current conference is its innovative format of public-private partnership. The discussions will profit from the participation of ministers of defense and interior, senior military officials, heads of security services, and representatives of influential non-governmental organizations.

We believe that the security challenges our societies face require that we go beyond the traditional mechanisms of developing strategies and decisions within the closed circle of government agencies. Instead, we should encourage the processes of active cooperation and exchange of ideas between public and private institutions. It is necessary to create better channels of communication and platforms for exchange of ideas even between traditionally separated government agencies, such as the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Interior. In addition, we think that it is difficult to find national solutions to challenges that are global or transnational. We are convinced that it is organizations like NATO that help strengthening an institutional thinking that combines the advantages of traditional instruments and experience with a broader degree of coordination in countering the new risks.

In today's world one of these risks—international terrorism—became the most threatening problem of the democratic societies and free economic development. Countering terrorism exclusively through military operations has provided discouraging results. The growing span of terrorist attacks shows that we are late with comprehending the factors, the roots, and the dynamics of this phenomenon. We are still behind in developing the best strategy for containing or eliminating the threat of terrorism. To solve this task it is important to strike a careful balance among all available international instruments. Along with the traditional military counter-measures we need adequate new political, legal, and economic initiatives that would limit the social base of terrorism.

The topic of terrorism is closely connected to the issue of organized crime, which is the most immediate threat to our region. Organized crime threatens not only the security, the rights, and the interests of the citizens but also the stability of the democratic institutions and the success of economic reforms. Most CSD analyses that examine the symbiosis among organized crime and political corruption, and the “gray-black” economy, provided policy-makers with valuable knowledge to design effective policies to counter these threats.

- Organized crime groups in Southeast Europe are connected and have similar roots—the former security and intelligence services and ex-combatants in the region's wars. Often, organized crime groups in Southeast Europe exchange “favors” and commit crimes in neighboring countries, thus being able to more easily escape investigation and prosecution.
- The structure of organized crime in Southeast Europe does not correspond to the traditional hierarchical model of such crime groups. Instead, it is rather a complex network of individuals and organizations.
- The “gray” and “black” sectors of the national economies account for between 20% and 40% of the GDPs of the countries in the region. In some areas of the Western Balkans these sectors create more than 50% of GDP and along with widespread corruption mechanisms they provide a fertile soil for continuing or expanding criminal activities.
- When the “gray” and “black” economies reach such large share of the GDP, they become a significant source of investments in the legal economy. The formal and informal economies become so interdependent and interconnected that the line between legal and illegal economic activity becomes blurred.
- The above facts along with an environment, often marked by closely-knit networks of friends and family members, guarantee an easy access of “gray” and “black” networks to law-enforcement agencies. This makes the security-sector reform in Southeast European countries a challenge that most countries or institutions cannot surmount on their own.

Under the influence of studies like CSD's and the monitoring of national or international think-tanks, the closed institutional approach of government agencies towards organized crime began to change. More efficient instruments and more concerted efforts are needed to prevent the coagulation of organized crime and state power. We believe that it is necessary

to consider the development of a common strategy to counter organized crime and corruption in Southeast Europe in accordance with the common European priorities and practices.

A key role in such an effort is to be played by non-state actors in politics and international relations—corporations, business associations and influential non-governmental organizations. Successful, though, could be only reforms that mobilize the efforts of national governments, international actors, such as NATO and the European Union, and their member-states, as well as civil society.

I wish success to all participants in the conference.



Plamen Panayotov
Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria

*Your Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,*

It is an honor and pleasure for me to be with you here on such a big day for Europe when Bulgaria's Prime Minister is in Rome to sign, along with all EU leaders, the European Constitution. On this day Europe is turning a new page in its history raising new hopes for the future. These new hopes for Bulgaria are inseparably linked with its membership in NATO and the EU.

I wish to thank the Center for the Study of Democracy who, by organizing this second high-profile SEE security forum, have laid the grounds of a very useful tradition. I believe that such events contribute to the transformation of SEE into a zone of peace, security and stability. They are not merely fora at which to discuss and formulate new ideas about future development. They bring to life our willingness and ability to work in partnership in a variety of forms and at all levels in order to attain our common goals.

One such major goal for all of us is to achieve durable peace in Southeast Europe. In the pursuit of this goal we can rely on our staunch and influential allies – NATO and the EU. Before I consider their key role for security and stability in the region, however, I would like to examine briefly the contemporary challenges we face.

The first challenge is associated with the new millennium's global security threats of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The second challenge is more regional. It is the result of last decade's crises and conflicts in the Western Balkans, of sluggish reforms in some SEE countries, of economic pitfalls, corruption, trans-border organized crime, and trafficking in people, drugs and arms. These two sets of risks are closely related and interdependent. Terrorism is much more likely to spring up among chaos and poverty, while the monies of organized crime, people and drug traffickers are frequently invested in terrorist activities. The regional challenges, therefore, must not be narrowly viewed as an impediment to the Western Balkans' Euro-Atlantic integration. If these challenges could be tackled successfully, the more global terrorist threat would also be defeated.

If NATO's and EU's involvement into regional security issues was to be defined in a single sentence, it would read: **The "peaceful and prosperous Balkans" has two steadfast supporters – NATO and the EU.** And this has been proven on numerous occasions in the last decade. NATO was the key force in the settlement of former

Yugoslavia's dissociation's bloody conflicts. The Alliance has acted as the main guarantor of regional stability ever since its first 1993 operation in the Balkans which was its first operation beyond its own territorial limits as well. The Alliance's political and military interventions at times of crisis have been of fundamental importance as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Macedonia prove.

At its Istanbul summit in June of this year the Alliance identified the Balkans as a region of strategic importance and confirmed its commitment to integrate all Balkan states in Euro-Atlantic structures in accordance with the NATO membership standards. One instance of this commitment are the NATO-led operations in the Western Balkans. The summit also stressed NATO's keynote political involvement, military presence and partnership with the Balkan countries as a way to establish security and stability.

By the end of this year NATO should have completed the transformation of its role in Bosnia and Herzegovina which is the result of the reassessment done by the Alliance of the situations and needs of the Western Balkans. SFOR is to be replaced by the EU-led operation Altea. My use of the word "transformation" is far from accidental. These changes are often publicly described as an "end of NATO's mission" in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is practically not true. The Alliance is going to keep its presence through an HQ in Sarajevo staffed by 150 people. Moreover, operation Altea is to be carried out according to the Berlin Plus formula which means that it will use up NATO forces and capabilities. Thus, the Alliance is keeping its direct involvement in BiH stability issues, albeit in a different form.

In addition, NATO will preserve its Kosovo mission through the KFOR at least by the middle of 2005 when the standards fulfillment assessment will be carried out according to the standards-before-status policy. By the same line, the US – a key partner to Bulgaria, are also going to keep their own mission in the province.

NATO's enlargement policy is another important contribution to security and stability in Southeast Europe. For Romania and Bulgaria NATO membership has proven to be a strong impetus to reforms in the course of their transition to democracy. It is essential for the new aspiring countries Albania, Macedonia and Croatia to negotiate a fixed date for receiving full NATO membership. It is no less important for Serbia and Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina to start their Euro-Atlantic integration through the Partnership for Peace initiative. Besides the positive impact on these countries' domestic situation, it will encourage them to a greater participation in regional security cooperation. Thus, the investment in trust will prove to be an investment in the security and welfare of Southeast Europe.

Besides these political and defense aspects of NATO's presence in the region, there are some strong economic aftereffects as well, and we say that from experience. Statistical data show that foreign investment in Bulgaria has had a nine-fold increase since the country's original invitation for membership in November 2002 – from 900 m. to over 8 billion USD. This is all in all the result of the overall government policy to create the best possible investment climate, secure rapid economic growth and improve citizens' welfare. The 2005 budget is also founded on this policy. Considering economic figures, we could ask what economic progress Bulgaria would have made,

had it been invited for NATO membership earlier. Consequently, the sooner the three new candidates are admitted as members, the better for the whole region.

I would like to speak now about the other strategic supporter of the SEE cause, that is, the European Union. The EU like NATO was a catalyst to the process of transition to peace, stability and democracy through its overall policy of integration and through the operations conducted by EU members in the Western Balkans.

All SEE countries have set EU membership as their utmost priority which has led them to implement a large-scale remedial efforts in the basic public domains – politics, business, social services and the administration. The goal pursued by SEE societies is sustainable democracy and market economy based on the rule of law, on respect for human rights and the rights of minorities, on ethnic, religious and cultural tolerance. Moreover, they are aiming at an effective counteraction to corruption and crime.

The stabilization and association process launched by the European Union became the landmark of the Union's integration policy concerning the Western Balkans. The results achieved so far are quite optimistic. I will only dwell on some of the most recent events. The Association Agreement of the Macedonia has become effective and the country has officially applied for EU membership. Albania has started negotiations to conclude a Stabilization and Association Agreement. The Commission has initiated preliminary procedures on Stabilization and Association Agreements with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia and Montenegro. Croatia has received an EU candidate-country status and will start its accession negotiations in early 2005.

The traditional idea of the EU as a civil and economic entity deprived of ambitions and means to act on defense issues has been turned upside down by its Western Balkan interventions – the EUPM in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the operations Concordia and Proxima in Macedonia. The forthcoming operation Altea in Bosnia and Herzegovina will fortify the EU's new security-related role.

Concerning operation Altea, it is very important to note that it is going to be managed by the EU, under its auspices, but will be performed through NATO forces and capabilities. Thus Balkan security and stability are regarded not simply as an area where both organizations contribute or a zone of overlapping interests. They are also set as a common goal the achievement of which NATO and the EU jointly pursue. Working towards this goal NATO and the EU adopted a joint approach for the Western Balkans in July 2003.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

NATO and the EU have one more vital part in the region – they have encouraged closer ties between the SEE countries as a way to achieve regional security. They have consistently sent messages about **the indispensability of regional cooperation in the progress to both our NATO and EU accession**. The governments of NATO members Greece and Turkey gave their unequivocal support to this policy. The EU in its turn created special financial instruments to fund trans-border and regional cooperation. Thus, the policy agenda of the region at present is set by the local advocates of the Euro-Atlantic ideas. They are a majority and this majority's actions are based on a

culture of cooperation rather than rivalry and division. Present-day Southeast Europe is a more secure place than it has ever been. Bound by its Euro-Atlantic ideals it is no longer susceptible to the causes that once divided it.

I would like to assure you that as a recent NATO member and an EU member-to-be Bulgaria will unswervingly advocate the integration of all SEE countries in the two alliances. We will share experience and provide assistance to this end. We regard it as a purely Bulgarian interest to support the Balkan peoples in the name of peace and security in Europe and the world.

I believe that your conference will make a valuable contribution to this common goal of ours and I wish you every success!



Ambassador Alessandro Minuto Rizzo
NATO Deputy Secretary General

Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen, Good morning.

It is always a pleasure to come here to Sofia, and I am delighted to be here today as this is my first visit since Bulgaria joined the Alliance earlier this year. I do not think that 10 years ago many people anticipated that Bulgaria, Romania and Slovenia would today be members of NATO. Indeed, when I look back and compare the security landscape of South East Europe 10 years ago with the situation today, I am struck by the tremendous change that has taken place. And I am particularly struck by how much NATO has contributed to that change.

I should therefore like to thank the conference organisers for having invited me to set the scene for the first panel session today. It provides the opportunity to remind ourselves briefly of NATO's contribution to stability and security in South East Europe. And in looking at the new challenges faced by the region, I shall make some comments that you may wish to take up during the panel discussion.

But before doing that, I should like to bring you all up to date with where NATO stands at the moment. Providing security today means projecting stability in regions far away from home. In a strategic environment that is marked by terrorism, failed states and proliferation, we have to be able to tackle the problems when and where they arise. We have to act, and act quickly, otherwise these problems will end up on our doorstep. Most of today's challenges emerge from places outside of Europe. This means that we had to move NATO beyond being a purely "Eurocentric" Alliance. This is exactly what we have done and was demonstrated in our decision last year to deploy to Afghanistan. And it was reinforced this year at Istanbul, when we decided to expand our role in Afghanistan as well as take on a role in Iraq. We are already assisting Iraq to train its security forces, and we will enhance this effort soon.

This is a fundamental change, a transformation, in the way we think about - and employ - the Alliance. And this political transformation needs to be accompanied by the second feature of our new approach to security - military transformation. Put simply, the new missions require new capabilities, both to allow for a more rapid response to crises, as well as for long-term peace support operations. And through NATO's military reforms, we are addressing both these requirements.

Regarding the need for rapid responses, we now have the NATO Response Force. The NRF has already achieved its initial operational capability and it gives NATO Allies the capability to engage quickly, and collectively, wherever required.

But deploying the forces in an initial wave of a mission is only the beginning. We need to sustain those missions. That is why we are now reforming our force planning and force generation procedures, to bring them more in line with our political decision-making process. And we are also looking at how we fund our operations. These measures will help to ensure that our military means match our political ambitions.

Alongside our operations and efforts to improve our capabilities, we have the third feature of our new approach to security - stronger partnerships.

Through our commitment to partnership, we strive to bring stability and security to our partner countries. We offer our experience and expertise. And we bring transparency, which leads to confidence and trust. This confidence and trust in turn bring stability and security for everyone in the region.

And this leads me directly on to what I wanted to talk about today, our partnership with South East Europe. The South East Europe Initiative brings together, within a NATO framework, all countries from the region, including those who do not have any institutionalised ties with NATO. Through its various projects, this Initiative is already encouraging greater regional security cooperation.

In addition, the Membership Action Plan and Partnership for Peace programme helped to guide Bulgaria, Romania and Slovenia's preparations for their recent accession to NATO. These same programmes continue to provide NATO's Partners with the necessary advice and guidance for assisting them with their preparations for integration into the European and Euro-Atlantic institutions. Defence reform and associated improvements in security institutions are evident in all countries of the region. Military capabilities are being transformed from defence forces designed for territorial defence to forces that will have greater utility in crisis management and peacekeeping.

NATO announced at the Summit in Istanbul that the NATO-led mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina - SFOR - will be successfully concluded by the end of this year. And that we will hand over to the EU. But let me emphasise that this handover to the EU does not mark NATO's departure from the country. We will retain a NATO presence and we will continue to help the country with its defence reforms. This is because our goal remains to welcome Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Serbia and Montenegro, into our Partnership for Peace programme in due course, once the well known conditions are met. When these countries join the Partnership, all Balkan countries will be united with the rest of Europe in a cooperative security framework. It will be another significant step forward and will be a further indication that we have overcome the difficult past and are working together to build a promising future.

But against the background of these tremendous achievements, there remain a number of challenges. And if these challenges are not dealt with successfully, all the recent accomplishments risk being undermined. First and foremost among these challenges is safeguarding a stable and multi-ethnic Kosovo.

The eruption of violence in March this year was an unpleasant reminder of the tension and insecurity that is felt within that province. NATO can keep the peace, but a way

forward is needed for Kosovo's political future to provide long-term stability. I believe that Ambassador Eide's recent report to the United Nations' Secretary General on the situation in Kosovo provides an excellent basis for addressing this particular challenge. A number of steps are now being implemented. It is vital that we break the cycle of uncertainty, lack of investment, frustration and violence. Instability in Kosovo has implications for its neighbours and the region as a whole.

A challenge facing the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is next month's referendum on decentralisation. Naturally, it is for the citizens of that country to express their will as far as their future is concerned, but it is particularly important for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's future to ensure decentralisation. Decentralisation is a cornerstone of the Ohrid Agreement and an essential element to ensure the integration of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in the Euro-Atlantic institutions.

Security and stability in South East Europe is also challenged by organised crime, corruption, illegal migration, human trafficking and the unlawful trade in small arms. These activities have the potential to weaken governments. They are a ball and chain around the ankle of progress. And they tarnish the image of some parts of South East Europe. I acknowledge that a number of measures are being taken to address these challenges. But even more needs to be done. It is essential that the rule of law be strengthened. The police forces must be made more accountable and the judiciary must be seen to be both robust and independent. And border security must be improved.

Border security demands cooperation and coordination. This has been the spirit of the Ohrid Border Process launched in May 2003. NATO is keen that this yields practical results. That is why we attach particular importance to the follow-up of the process, as discussed during the Second Review Conference, two days ago in Tirana. A border always represents the interests of more than one nation, and therefore efforts by the one must be matched by the other. Since cooperation and coordination is required, it seems sensible to involve other international organisations in the process. And it is on this point, multilateral involvement, that I wish to conclude.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As the NATO Deputy Secretary General, I have, naturally, focused on what NATO has done to assist the development of South East Europe. NATO remains committed to providing further assistance. And let me stress that NATO commitment means transatlantic involvement. But NATO is not alone. We cooperate closely with the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. In addition, NATO is developing its strategic partnership with the EU. Together, the Stability Pact and NATO's Partnership for Peace programme have contributed significantly to bringing stability to South East Europe. Our concerted approach on security and stability in the Western Balkans has been instrumental in bringing an end to conflict and stabilising that region. This concerted approach emphasises the common vision and determination that the two organisations share. It also stresses the importance of local ownership. Together, with each other and with the governments of the region, NATO and the EU are already acting to address the challenges that I have outlined. Thank you.



Nikolay Svinarov
Minister of Defense of Bulgaria

*Dear Mr. Deputy Prime Minister,
Dear Guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen,*

Allow me first to thank the Center for the Study of Democracy for hosting a second international security conference, a conference where we – policy makers, government members and experts, can get together to discuss the present-day security issues.

Due to the immense progress of information technologies and the ever freer movement of ideas, people, goods and capital in the last fifteen years globalization has affected all human endeavors. On the positive side, this process has greatly facilitated communication at all levels – between states, organisations, communities, and individuals, and in all possible spheres – political, economic, financial, and cultural. It has enlarged the scope of cooperation towards the achievement and protection of common interests. The inter-dependency and growing interaction between states and individuals have increased mutual trust and undermined the sources of contradiction and tension between the states.

Globalization's negative drift, however, has made nation-states much more vulnerable to asymmetric security threats. The nation-states are therefore trying to establish areas of common interests and responsibilities which could sustain and reinforce world peace and security.

Today's conference has brought together representatives of SEE states, and Southeast Europe is a region in which the common security interests have been recognized. We have recognized the need for peace, stability and national prosperity, but also the need to create favorable living and developmental conditions for each one of our citizens. The SEE perspective on security takes its many dimensions into account.

SEE countries today are facing similar problems. It is common knowledge that local organized crime has quickly weathered inter-state and inter-ethnic clashes and has used globalization to benefit from its own international integration. We must grudgingly admit that the Balkans are a junction of major trafficking channels – of drugs, human beings and arms. Some historians and analysts of the region consider its geography and the range of ethnic, religious and cultural communities a formidable challenge to SEE governments. I prefer to view them as opportunities which, if properly used, could be transformed into advantages and help overcome our present-day problems.

Through their membership in NATO and the EU SEE countries can achieve and guarantee greater security at home, but they also could contribute to the joint efforts of all member states towards greater peace, stability and prosperity.

I will not dwell on the political aspects of this membership. I cannot but mention, however, that EU and Euro-Atlantic prospects are transforming the region's economic and investment climate. Security is a staple of investment-friendly environments. But ample investment could in its turn bring stability and prosperity to states, businesses and individuals.

Along with this, NATO and EU membership is a responsibility which we must prove our readiness to bear. For the positive effects to be achieved accession is only done at a certain level of a country's readiness. So progress to accession means a deep transformation in all areas of life and also, a different security philosophy.

Bulgaria espouses NATO's open-door policy reconfirmed at the Istanbul Summit. Bulgaria's foreign policy prioritizes the NATO integration of SEE countries. The next cycle of NATO enlargement will be a further vital contribution to the security and stability in the Western Balkans.

Bulgaria supports the new candidate states in their efforts to full NATO memberships, as well as Serbia and Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina on their way to becoming PfP countries. These countries' integration efforts must be backed by active bilateral and multilateral defense and political cooperation.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me at the end to reiterate my conviction that the West Balkan states are facing bright prospects in terms of joint political and defense efforts. We don't have to start from scratch, but we need to go deeper and look for solutions even in hands-on matters.

Bulgaria would gladly participate in both high-profile and expert-level meetings; in joint military exercises; in joint economic and technical defense initiatives; in information exchange, etc. We are ready to share our NATO and EU applicant experience, our planning and defense expertise, our knowledge of staff training and of the necessary legal framework in the defense and security domains.

I believe that the right approach involves consultations and experience sharing which is being proven by today's conference.

Thank you for your attention! I wish you every success!



Dominick Chilcott

Director, EU Policy, UK Foreign Office

Good morning your Excellences, Ministers and Deputy Secretary General! Ladies and gentlemen, it's a great honor to be invited to participate in such a distinguished panel and to address this prestigious audience on an important subject, the new security risks to this region. And I congratulate, as other have done, the Center for the Study of Democracy for having organized this conference, their second conference in a year. I apologize for my voice; I am afraid I have a cold. This is not totally inappropriate as I think one of the security risks is the spread of disease around Europe and I am bringing some British germs to Bulgaria to share that I can give the practical as well as talk about the theory.

My emphasis in my brief remarks, as the Director for Europe in the Foreign Office, will be more, I think, on the European Union contribution to dealing with the security threats than the NATO one and again it's an appropriate ay as the Deputy Prime Minister said to reflect little bit on what the European Union is doing in the region because as we know heads of government are in Rome signing the Constitutional Treaty. This may be called the Second Treaty of Rome concerning the European Union and many of us have hopes that whereas the first treaty of Rome launched the development of the institutions of the European Union, the second treaty will as it were provide the finalité of the process of integration and the development of the institutions and allow us to say that the rulebook for the European Union has now been settled and we can get on with the real business of doing the work according to that rulebook. And I should also say in a bilateral capacity how delighted my government is, the British government is, in the progress that Bulgaria is making in its own journey towards European Union membership and we look forward very much, in Britain, to working with Bulgaria as a partner in the European Union from January 2007.

And so to the main subject matter, I hope it would be of no surprise to anybody that I agree very much with the thrust of what previous speakers have said and I will try to avoid too much repetition of their remarks because they seem to me to be exactly right. I think looking at security threats in this region, one can broadly divide them into three categories, although I admit these aren't exclusive. There is sort of classic state aggression, one state aggressing against another which of course is not a new security threat and indeed there is a very strong sense that that sort of aggression is history that it won't recur and we have moved on from there to a sort of Professor Francis Fukuyama view of the world. However, it does depend a little bit, I think, on where you sit and I was involved in the negotiations to bring a settlement to Cypress which I hope isn't considered that very off of this conference earlier in this year and

when Greeks Cypriots voted in very large numbers, by majority of over 75 percent, against the United Nations plan for settlement in Cypress, one of the reasons they did so is they felt that the issue of possible Turkish intervention in the South of the island hadn't been dealt with adequately in the plan. So, although, I think, we don't need to deal in looking at the new security threats with state aggression, there are still pockets, shall we say, in our region who still worry about state aggression.

A second area, I would say is the consequences of state failure or the consequences of bad governance or failure of governance and other speakers have already dwelt on these to some extent in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, but clearly organized crime, legal immigration, people trafficking, drugs trafficking and the spread of disease are all consequences of this, which represent new threats we have to deal with. And then the third area, which is not specific to this region, that is a new challenge, which we all have to face, is the threat from international terrorism, which again has been mentioned.

Just very briefly, responses to these different categories of threats: clearly the most effective response to the possibility of state aggression is to join credible and strong alliance committed to collective defense. So with the expansion of NATO, and I congratulate Bulgaria and the other six countries who joined NATO in March 2004, in a sense that is being perfectly, adequately and correctly addressed. But of course, as the Deputy Secretary General and others have said, joining NATO and the prospect of joining NATO bring so much more than just collective security for the countries concerned. State failure: state failure, as I said, is still with us in the Balkans. I think that itself divides into two categories. The first issue of state failure is the sort of unrest, instability, the conflict, the humanitarian crisis, which we have seen at various times in different parts of the Western Balkans. Whereas the second category is really about good governance, the failure of the administration to administer properly the corruption, breakdown in the rule of law, which follows after that.

Now, as others have said, NATO has developed an absolutely excellent track record of intervening to dealing with perhaps the first category of the consequences of state failure, the conflict, instability, unrest and the humanitarian crisis, and indeed, as the Deputy Secretary General said, NATO is realizing that it has to deal with the consequences of state failure when out of area by the European continent in Afghanistan and in Iraq in order to ensure the stability of as it were the home front. I think the European Union has also understood in the last decade or so that it too has to be able to operate in this area, as well. I think we all remember the bitter experience of Bosnia in the early nineteen nineties, when Luxembourg had the presidency of the European Union at that time, Jacques Poos, who was a great European and a very powerful and influential foreign minister of the Council, unfortunately, stood before the cameras and said that the hour of Europe has now come, meaning that Europe was going to solve the problem of the former Yugoslavia and Bosnia in particular. And as we all know, the immediate result was humiliation for the European Union, as it found it did not have the policies nor the instruments in order to stabilize the situation. So that was one lesson.

We also learned the lesson of the unwisdom of pursuing a policy that didn't have support and backing from the United States and it was only when we linked up

with the United States that we managed to have a coherent and coordinated policy which demonstrated and brought about change and improvements on the ground. So those were two lessons. There was also a sort of third lesson for the European Union, although more generic sort, which is even when we have diplomatic pressure, which is useful in itself, as Kofi Annan reminded us in another context, diplomatic pressure backed by the credible threat of military force is even more effective. So against this background the European Union decided it needed to take upon itself the development of a security and defense policy that could make a difference and, the Saint-Malo British-French summit in 1998, was of course a breakthrough. Up until that point I think suspicion in my government, in my country, about pursuing military structures outside of NATO had inhibited us from allowing European security and defense policy to reach its potential. But once the conditions were right to remove that inhibition, in a relatively short time we saw the fruits of European work in this area and, as others have mentioned, the European Union is now "finding its feet" through operation Concordia in Macedonia in 2003. There was operation Artemis of course in the Kongo, more recently and we look forward to operation Altea in Bosnia next year. I should emphasize that this development of the European Union, the security and defense policy, is happening in an entirely NATO friendly way and there is one rather good illustration of this, which is that the mission, the European Union mission in Bosnia next year is going to be led by the United Kingdom, whereas the NATO mission in Kosovo, K-4, is being led by France. So as it were we are playing perhaps the opposite roles to the ones you might suspect if you took rather simplistic view of these developments.

The great advantage the European Union brings to dealing with failed states and to the failures of governments and I am not suggesting at all this is a beauty contest between NATO and the European Union but the great advantage that the European Union brings is that it has as it were a comprehensive package of policies that it can apply in a country. It has peacekeeping troops now that are credible and effective. It can deploy civilian police on crisis management operations, as well, but it also has humanitarian and reconstruction aids that it can deploy and the European Union member states are the largest aid donor in the world, and it has technical assistance and budgets for training for the institutions of states in difficulty. And as well as that the European Union has very powerful trade measures, either negative in the sense of the application of sanctions, the denial of access to the European Union's very considerable single market or the opposite, incentives through giving preferential trade access to our single market in order to incentivize states to make progress, reform and improve their behavior. And on top of that of course there is the diplomatic pressure from 25 plus member states coordinating a policy, where they speak with a stronger voice collectively than any of them would do individually. In all of this of course the fact that the European Union is developing a strategic partnership with NATO makes it a very exciting prospect for NATO and the European Union to be marching hand in hand in this area, I think, is encouraging for us all. Of course, once the immediate crisis has been stabilized we enter perhaps the longer term, the second phase of state failure, the failure of the administration to administer, the breakdown in the rule of law, leading to criminality, corruption, trafficking and in general, I think, impoverishment of the country. I think I can't emphasize enough the importance, as we say it Britain, of establishing the rule of law in Southeast Europe adequately and sufficiently. As others have said that means robust and independent judiciary, an accountable police force,

functioning mechanisms to enforce judgments; all these are absolutely vital. They cannot be done by outsiders for establishing the rule of law, because ultimately we are talking about trust between countries in the establishment of security. All European countries have an interest in every other European country's capacity and will to enforce the rule of law. Criminal activities of course notoriously do not respect international boundaries and London is affected by, for example, Turkish drug traffickers every bit as much as Istanbul is and perhaps we have a larger market for their products maybe more so. The most powerful weapon in the European Union's armory in helping to promote reform and encouraging governments to establish, enforce and implement the rule of law is of course our enlargement policy and offering the prospective of membership. Accession provides the most powerful incentive to this region. We all know how it works in this room. The Commission produces its regular reports as the sort of honest referee of the process and the European Union member states apply the conditionality allowing an aspirant country to move backwards or hopefully forwards on its journey towards membership, according to the progress it is making in reaching European standards. And to help them do that there is European aid and the Twinning projects from individual member states and their own bilateral aid programs. The record of enlargement has been fabulously successful and speaks for itself but let me very briefly remind this audience where we were as recently as twenty or thirty years ago. In the early 1970s Spain, Portugal, Greece and Turkey all had shall we say unsatisfactory political systems and in Central and Eastern Europe this audience does not need reminding about the dead hand of communism, the stifling of enterprise and individual liberty. I contend that it was enlargement that provided the compass by which these countries, in Iberia, in the Eastern Mediterranean, in Central Europe once they had the opportunity to change, and I don't argue that the European Union necessarily provided this opportunity but once they had that opportunity, they saw the direction they wanted to head in and they were able to navigate their way towards that goal.

In the former Yugoslavia, the more proximate area for our conference today, progress is a bit more mixed but I think without the prospective of membership we have to ask ourselves whether Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, and Albania would be making the efforts that they are clearly making, and indeed Bosnia too. The timing of when reforms will be introduced and implemented in these countries is uncertain but I think provided that the possibility of European membership remains open to them the ultimate destination of these countries and ultimate achievement of reforms in the rule of law and European standards in the economical and political fields is not in doubt.

Finally, a very brief word on international terrorism to complete the picture. The point of terrorism is of course to produce a disproportionately large effect, spreading fear and terror amongst our communities and populations for a relatively small action, which impacts on a relatively small number of individuals. And I do think that all of us, policy makers, think-tankers, journalists and others who have an opportunity to shape public opinion have a responsibility not to play the terrorists' game by serving their objectives and getting things out of proportion. But I don't give too many examples of this, but we suffer at the moment in the United Kingdom with the broadcast videos of our individual hostages in Iraq, which has a tremendous effect throughout our country and this is one example how really a relatively small

action all be it at the terrible and tragic individually concerned and their families, nonetheless has a quite disproportionate effect across our community.

Having said that, there is more that we collectively, as countries in the international community or as member states of the European Union, there is more that we can and should be doing to combat the threat from international terrorism whether it's in the sphere of sharing of information and intelligence or whether it's in adopting sufficiently rigorous legislation, at the same time bearing in mind the need not to transgress individual freedoms and liberties or to do so only to the very minimum necessary, or adopting the necessary legislation to be able to take action against terrorist organizations and individuals. We have created, in the European Union, a very free society where we can move people, capital, goods, money around our countries without challenge and we must not allow those freedoms to be abused by people who are pursuing the objectives of terrorism. But as well as trying to take action, rightly, against terrorist organizations we should look to at the causes of terrorism. We must be tough on terrorism and tough on the causes of terrorism, to paraphrase a famous statement by my prime minister. So there Mister Chairman I think I would like to stop and I congratulate once again the organizers of the conference for organizing and hosting this important event and I look forward to the discussions to follow.



Ambassador Michael Sahlin
EU Special Representative in Macedonia

I would say good morning and I would say Günaydın, because after all it is the Turkish national day! Congratulations! And I would say congratulations also to my friend Ognian Shentov, whom I've known before and who was kind enough to invite me to come back here and to address at this time a very dignified audience, including the Minister of Defense from Skopje who just arrived; Hello!. We hear many thoughtful things this morning, concerning the general approach of NATO, of the international community and of the EU as crisis managers and as handlers of the promotion of stability and progress in this region. I would now add to that, and I would try to be brief and not to repeat things, but I will add the perspective of the country where I am the special representative of the European Union, namely a country that was formerly a republic of Yugoslavia and that is now since a number of years an independent state, Macedonia and which is struggling with its history being very complex and with the most recent past that has been rather complex also. The past being one filled with lots of wars, lots of questions of identity arising from those conflicts and that is now aspiring for both EU and NATO membership, and as such heavily supported by those organizations.

The conflict that broke out in 2001, I am speaking slowly by the way as I promised to the organizers. I know something about organizing big conferences because I don't have a written manuscript, I will, later. The conflict in 2001 broke out therefore in a country that most observers in beforehand had seen as example in the Balkan region of peaceful coexistence in the wider region marked by violent conflicts as we know. Nonetheless, in that country it was seen to be useful just in case to have something called UNPREDEP as seen at the time as one or in fact as the example of successful conflict prevention mission. It lasted not long enough, in my view, but that's another story. Had one scratched a bit on the surface more ambitiously than was done at the time in view of other conflicts dominating the scene, one might have discovered, however, a country that had the signs of not fully healed ethnic differences, in fact, rather large-scale inter-ethnic discontent, exasperated by a bad economic situation.

The outbreak of the conflict in 2001 sparked an intense effort by the international community feeling that this time one must be acting strongly and early enough to prevent that conflict from becoming a wide, large-scale bloody civil war. That effort culminated in the summer 2001, in August of that year, in the signing of the OHRID Framework Agreement. I wish that the list of participants had fulfilled its promise to having Mr. James Pardew here, because if he had been here, then I would have had the chance to bow in respect to him because what he did together with the representative of the EU then, Francois Lyotard, was really great and a work of lasting value. The aim of these efforts that summer, as you know, was to put an end

to the conflict before it grew into a full-fledged civil war and to help ensure that the country's stability and prosperity become realized. These efforts continue even today, and in fact this is why I am here today. All be it with a different prospective now. It is now not to end hostilities, that is now behind us, "in Shalom", but to ensure long-term stability and economic development. Let it be clear, I think it is clear, to everyone in this room and everyone else too, not present, that Macedonia's road to Euro-Atlantic integration and a better future goes through the full implementation of that accord, signed that summer. Nothing less, nothing more, nothing different but that, because it was painstakingly negotiated and is still valid; there is no other way. Those who believe there might be another way, I think are playing it wrong, there is no other way; that is the road to take, there are no shortcuts. This in a sense is a first conclusion from my remarks here: firm international commitment, coherence and engagement are essential to make the international communities' peace and reconciliation efforts successful. These are essential, indispensable ingredients and that is also, by the way, why both the EU and the US work as "cosignatories?" of that agreement having therefore a special role now, together with NATO and all the concerning cooperation with the authorities of the country to fulfill all the provisions of that agreement. Aiming as I said for Euro-Atlantic integration and progress, and stability.

After the conflict millions of euro have been put into the reconstruction and implementation of that framework agreement and we are still there to pursue these efforts. The EU showed its long term commitment by keeping the position of the EU SR, now me, in place. The EU showing it also by taking over functions that were formerly provided by other organizations. We had the Concordia mission, the first of its kind for the EU and now we have the police mission, Proxima, another interesting innovation in the development of ESDP. In fact, the country I am talking about has a key role in the development of the ESDP in many, many ways, as you pointed out too. So that is not beauty contest as you said; in fact the EU actions in that country, in Macedonia, are NATO friendly and whatever NATO does is EU friendly so that's not even benign competition, there is full complementarity. A word about the mission Proxima, an innovation in its kind but others are to follow in the development of the ESDP of the European Union. It's a good example of how a mission in itself can represent the overall transition in the support of the international community and of the EU in this case from open crisis management, military, shuttle diplomacy, military for stabilization, then going civilian, then entering into a next phase of more general aid and especially accession support in various ways the accession being as you said a very powerful incentive to overcome all sorts of hurdles for these countries.

The government of Macedonia has recently invited Proxima to extend its mission for one more year knowing that the functioning of this police mission not being so security relevant in the longer but very much supportive of the processes of reform, police reform and other reforms that are going on and play key role in the development of the country. Therefore, there will be one more year with Proxima and then we will see. It's rather unusual because ESDP missions are very rarely extended but in this case it was by powerful consensus decision. Then of course in the overall family of instruments of the European Union we have in addition present and actively working in support of the country, where we have the role of the presidency; we have EU MM having a small but chief functioning component in this overall repertoire of the instruments of crisis management and support.

So if you were to ask me right now, I hope you don't, how long do I think that EU SR office is going to remain in Macedonia, maybe Mr. Buckovski has an answer to this, I don't know, my answer would be that probably no more than until summer or so because then the intention after all is that this would be in a transition towards general accession support rather than crisis management. Proxima in what is doing provides example of what the transition means in practical terms. So, what is the point of this protracted, sustained and firm commitment? It is to bridge the gap between direct crisis management, military, civilian and to the rapprochement to European structures and thereby to ensure stability and progress.

The security situation has been remarkably improved during those years of the operation of these area's activities. Macedonia has not seen a serious security incident in more than a year now, I hope it stays like that, I think it will. Since 2001, there has been steady progress both on the security front and on the political front, political front mainly referring to step-by-step implementation of this framework agreement. You could say, unfortunately, there is one thing missing; that is significant progress on the economic front. A lot could be said about that and a lot could be said about interaction between political stabilization and economic progress but I know that the economy is considered among the highest priorities of the government and rightly so, unavoidably so. One of the reasons, I believe for some lack of significant progress on the economic front is that the framework agreement has still not been fully implemented. Full implementation of the agreement is a condition in many ways that take too long to explore now for economic progress and not as some people might have wanted to believe an obstacle for economic progress, no, these are complementary and mutually reinforcing things.

I would say, after this conflict stage there are three things that have to be done in order to pave the way for the much needed and much asked for economic progress in the country. Of course, first the cessation of hostilities and stabilization of the security situation. This step is taken as I said and it is clearly shown also by the fact that the international community has step-by-step reduced its military operational presence in the country, trusting that there is necessary minimum stability sustainable now. Second, the peace agreement has to be implemented fully. Significant program has been made on the implementation but there are still the last bits and pieces that represent, if you are climbing a mountain or seeking to beat the world record in high jumping, the last centimeters, the really tricky ones normally; so huge efforts will have to be undertaken in order to achieve that. You cannot compare those centimeters with the early ones, so to speak. Third, the important structural reforms of the judiciary, the labor market, public sectors, etc., have to be made in order to create an environment ready for investments, in fact being inviting for investments. This part too has been started but there is still work to be done on this. So, taking these areas of activity together, which is very much overlapped to what EU accession means and what EU accession takes, the handing over recently, in fact on the first of October this year, of the questionnaire by Mr. Prodi visiting Skopje, the questionnaire to be answered and then for the Commission to put its opinion on paper, what would they think in the light of the way the government responded to those three or four thousand questions concerning whether Macedonia is ready or not to become a candidate for membership. So Mr. Prodi's visit therefore marked a very symbolic step, a turning point; the focus is now increasingly as it should be on reforms related to the economy,

EU rapprochement should work as a powerful incentive in the implementation of necessary economic reforms which are good for stability too in this mutually reinforcing way.

There are still hurdles. The Financial Times for one had an article in July called "Example Macedonia," hailing Macedonia's efforts to come to terms with its ethnic differences as you could say in many ways Macedonia was hailed in the nineties also, on that occasion less justifiably perhaps. Now, we have a referendum coming up soon, next week, next Sunday, concerning whether to proceed or not on the path; this time I am referring to the decentralization step that is a necessary ingredient in all these accession processes and for decentralization there must be municipal boundaries' changes and for these there has to be obedience with the double majority principles guiding not only OHRID agreement but also in other ways. I did not intend to elaborate on the question of what is entailed in this major decision on the part of the Macedonian people. Will they say yes in this referendum, will the referendum be successful meaning valid, meaning more than 50 percent participating, and will most of those that vote, vote yes, which by the way is very much likely, then this means that they prefer to retain the former municipal boundaries and with it their whole decentralization package as now painstakingly elaborated and adopted by Parliament so there are huge things at stake next Sunday. I will elaborate on that specific thing no more, I think you are aware of the importance of that date.

My hope of course in my role, professional and personal role, will be that Macedonia will continue on its path forward, forward being defined of course in terms of accession, stabilization and progress, rather than to choose to go somewhere else than forward. Peaceful coexistence, inter-ethnic coexistence is what is asked for of all countries of the European Union including the aspiring candidates. In conclusion, successful crisis-management requires, from an EU perspective, number one, a firm commitment, I am stressing firm and commitment, number two, close partnership with other international actors, no beauty contest, no competitiveness but complementarity is the essential ingredient, as we heard formerly this morning. In the case of Macedonia, I am referring especially to US-EU cooperation because of this unique role that flew from the OHRID agreement. And then thirdly, a clear prospective for the future that is necessary, there must readiness to receive countries that are fighting and are responding to our demands signified by the rapprochement in this case to the European structures. Thank you!



Mate Raboteg
State Secretary for Defence
Ministry of Defence, Republic of Croatia

Mr. Deputy Secretary General, Dear Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish to thank the organizers for inviting us and giving me the opportunity to present Croatian thinking and opinions in front of this distinguished auditory, and in this way contribute to further development of mutual understanding and confidence.

Part of South East Europe is still feeling the consequences of conflicts in the last decade of the 20th century. However, thanks to engagement of the international community we can state that today the possibility of the renewal of classic armed conflicts in the area of South East Europe has been reduced to a minimum. By active engagement, in the first place of NATO and EU, significant steps have been made towards stabilization of the Region and establishing lasting peace. The NATO-led SFOR and KFOR operations, with participation of partner states, and the EU “CONCORDIA” operation in Macedonia contributed decisively to long-term stabilization of the Region.

We believe that the transfer of mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina from NATO to EU, within the framework of the «Berlin +» arrangement, marks a new step in further stabilization of the Region. South East Europe is not a far away territory which needs to be stabilized but the area over which the EU will enlarge in future and encompass all the countries in that area. In this context, we welcome a more significant engagement of the EU.

Thanks to the minimal possibility of armed conflicts renewal and at the same time intensifying the activities of regional cooperation directed towards a common aim -entering Euro-Atlantic Integrations (NATO and European Union) - South East Europe states have begun to redefine their security concept This primarily refers to a new assessment of the security environment and security threats. Neighboring states are no longer perceived as the main security threat, but the source of instability for most countries in the Region has become common or similar to that of majority of European countries. To begin with, there are transnational threats - international terrorism, organized crime - in the first place trafficking of people and drugs, proliferation of weapons for mass destruction and the like.

Because they are transnational, no country can oppose these threats alone. Our task is to contribute to the establishment of such government institutions in the countries of our Region that will be able to face present day threats and that will cooperate with each other.

Allow me to express my satisfaction with the last latest round of enlargement within the Alliance. Admission of seven new countries to NATO definitely broadened the zone of stability and security in Europe and marked another step towards Europe without divisions. Croatia welcomes the continuation of NATO open door policy and expects the next round of enlargement with enthusiasm. The Final Communiqué of the Istanbul Summit recognized the Republic of Croatia as a serious candidate for NATO, to be invited to become a full-fledged member, based on individual progress assessment, by the next NATO Summit.

NATO and EU enlargement, in the first place the Slovenian and Hungarian membership in these integrations, contributed significantly to the overall security picture of the Region; Republic of Croatia directly borders with the allied system of collective security. However, instabilities which still exist in the region of South East Europe have emerged as the product of conflicts during the 1990's and the enduring transition process, that is, economic hardship. Emerged destabilizing factors influence the capability of certain government bodies to control the sources and bearers of such asymmetric threats in their entirety and at their best.

Lately asymmetric threats, among which international terrorism is the most dangerous one, have overshadowed almost entirely classic war conflicts and have fundamentally changed a traditional understanding of the term security. We remember with grief the tragic events of September 11, 2001 in the USA, the recent terrorist act in Madrid, and the daily terrorist activities in the World. Such a development of relations on the modified geopolitical map of Europe and the World indirectly influences the security environment of Croatia and the smoldering instabilities in the Region significantly influence the perception of our own security.

Croatia, aware of the mentioned challenges and risks, strongly supports the establishment and development of efficient democratic institutions in the Region and makes concrete efforts to contribute to the stability in the Region, by developing regional cooperation. Therefore, I stress that we support the integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia and Montenegro into Partnership for Peace and other Euro-Atlantic Integrations. We encourage both countries to fulfill commitments that are necessary for this step. We believe that their membership in the aforementioned integrations will contribute to further stabilization of the Region. Initiated defense reforms oriented towards the development of transparent institutions support the build-up of a system of confidence, stability, and lasting security in the Region.

Moreover, Republic of Croatia is aware that Croatian security system is more and more feeling the burden of the same security concerns our allies meet repeatedly. Croatia believes that the most effective response to asymmetric threats and risks is the membership in NATO and EU. Absence of direct military threat to the Republic of Croatia and the ascending process of establishing good neighborly relationships, as well as positive economic and social conditions within Croatia, create a favorable moment for the continuation of reforms in Croatian Armed Forces and for their transformation into force capable to respond to new security challenges - a force that can contribute to the NATO collective defense system, including NATO- and ELMed operations.

Our defense reforms and NATO membership support and complement each other. While the perspective of Alliance membership gives additional impetus to our reform efforts, with every new step we take in our reforms we move closer to meeting the requirements for NATO membership. Therefore, our defense reforms are oriented towards a more significant contribution to NATO than the one we are able to offer at the moment, with considerable stress on our own security and the security of our Region. The biggest Croatian contribution to NATO and the collective security in Europe will be Croatian positive role as a stability factor in the Region.

Moreover, Croatian government is conducting a broad spectrum of reforms with the aim to prepare the country for future NATO membership. The main tasks being: inner stabilization of the system, enhancing the relations with international community and meeting the commitments and criteria for NATO and EU accession, positive contribution to peace and stability reinforcement in this part of Europe, through proactive policy towards minorities and development of good neighborly relationships, solving all remaining and open issues in relations with neighbors, and readiness to participate actively in the work and missions of the international community. I wish to stress the need for full cooperation of the countries in the Region with the Hague Tribunal, and the fulfillment of assumed commitments.

As a good example of regional cooperation I would point out the cooperation of Croatia, Albania, and Macedonia, with the support of USA in the framework of US-Adriatic Charter (A-3). Cooperation through the US-Adriatic Charter intensifies dialogue on bilateral level as well as on trilateral level. Besides other politico-military activities, in progress is the design of operational-technical details for forming a combined Albanian-Croatian-Macedonian military medical team to be engaged in NATO-led operations.

The Republic of Croatia actively participates in the work of different regional initiative forums related to Central and South East Europe (Stability Pact, SEDM, CENCOOP, Quadrilateral Initiative and SEEI). Croatia is prepared to deepen its participation in common foreign and security policy as well as in European Security and Defense Policy supporting EU efforts to stabilize the Region, including logistic support to the EU mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Just as well, we will promptly meet the internationally assumed commitments in line with the Vienna document'99, sub-regional and other international agreements.

The Republic of Croatia is continuing its active participation in the ISAF mission in Afghanistan, supporting the activities of the Antiterrorist Coalition, as well as the implementation of the follow-up UN Security Council Resolutions. We support the expansion of the ISAF mission by founding Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) and offering participation of Croatian civilian experts as part of the German contingent.

Finally, I stress again that Croatia welcomes the Alliance involvement in the stabilization process of South East Europe and encourages further integration of the countries in the Region into Euro-Atlantic frameworks. Although we believe that the "worst days" are behind us, the future of South East Europe is still seen in the light of smoldering instabilities, so we stress the need for advance active NATO and

EU involvement in stabilization of the Region where certain ethnic conflicts and asymmetric threats still have a significant influence on our common security. Croatia sees the future of South East Europe only in complete integration of all countries in the Region into the Euro-Atlantic security association.

In the end, I would like once again to thank the hosts for the invitation. I expect even better cooperation in the future that will, I hope, for all of us be brighter and more secure.



Ambassador Lubomir Ivanov
Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to NATO

It is a pleasure for me to be part of CSD's second security conference. These conferences are turning into a valuable tradition and rightly so since the topics we are discussing are of immense impact. That this is a high-profile event is also quite relevant to the issues debated. I'd like to start with the topic of security risks in Southeast Europe because they are often defined in divergent terms. The concept of new risks has been overused not only lately. In my opinion, the novelty of these new challenges or new risks is rather relative. The actual new development, I think, is that after the September 11 attacks in the US and the March 11 in Spain international institutions have started paying considerable attention to these risks, although unfortunately it has taken an immense tragedy, trauma and shock for them to become properly noticed. The shock, however, has thrust the international community's agenda in the right direction and it is from there we should start discussing the SEE situation.

NATO and the EU first encountered the so called new challenges quite early – in Southeast Europe in the 1990s. The new developments that are presently inspiring new hopes concern the way key international organizations like NATO and the EU are starting to think and act – concertedly and consistently. This approach has produced the ESDP as a fundamental EU policy and a number of concrete EU-led key operations such as the one in Macedonia and Bosnia's operation Altea. The approach has led NATO to initiate a process of basic transformation which is visible in concrete operations – Afghanistan, the new plan for the Kosovo operation after the March events, and the mission of training the Iraqi security forces. All these processes clearly indicate the new approach of both NATO and the European Union to security issues. The adoption of this approach, however, is neither easy, nor unproblematic.

I would like to discuss here the perspective of Bulgaria, a country which has just joined NATO and will very soon, hopefully in 2007, become a European Union member. One of the cornerstones of NATO as a defense alliance are the mechanisms of collective defense set forth in Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty. Since NATO has functioned primarily as a collective defense organization for decades, it has almost flawless planning and synchronization in this area. The not-so-good news is that collective defense is least likely to be needed in the modern world. Of course, the Alliance does possess decision-taking and implementation mechanisms for operations and missions outside Article V's scope. But NATO needs a great deal of concrete input and consistency as to the nature and level of commitment in operations not covered by Article V. They also need a reasonable degree of predictability and transparency in a sufficiently long term.

This would be impossible without adequate forces and capabilities which should be interoperable, mobile and ready to deploy. Because of all this, NATO and the EU are trying to make careful and sound assessment of the risks and challenges involved. This needs to be done at SEE country level as well. We need to step beyond inherited complexes, inertia and the special interests of particular branches or clubs. Such an objective approach might seem easy to achieve, but as some discussions over the strategic issue of defense have shown, we have not grown out of these restrictions yet.

What are the forces and capabilities needed? We need quality – quality in materiel, maintenance, and communications which are the usual weak points of an operation. The classical territorial defense forces are completely outdated because NATO-led operations require outstanding interaction capabilities. Territorial defense units could be numerous, but unusable. The concept of usability was introduced by NATO as very important and its meaning is still being negotiated. Next, each country needs to work on the basket of issues for which its capabilities are suited. These baskets will of course often overlap when NATO and EU matters are concerned because both organizations' requirements are similar despite the division of labor they are trying to achieve. Thirdly, in order to make a tangible assessment of our collective efforts needs, NATO and the EU should tailor their planning to efforts made at the national level. For instance, when we were discussing the air forces to be used in the NATO Response Force amphibious exercise in Sardinia we found out that fighter planes were offered by the member states during the planning of most operations. And to these offers strategic commanders invariably have to reply: "We kindly thank you but it's not what we need. We need cargo aircraft, refueling planes, things that we don't have and not those we have plenty of." There are many such examples and they imply that planning on both organizational and national level has to carefully take them into account, or otherwise our old problems will persist.

Each separate member state needs to consider these problems when planning its national defense. Territorial, air and sea defense should be planned so as to meet the actual needs and risks. Military efforts should be purposeful and carefully planned, realistic and supplied with all necessary resources.

The next key point is how most rationally to use the thin defense resources not only of recent NATO members like Bulgaria, but throughout the Alliance. There is a very simple solution to this problem – resources shouldn't be wasted on other than priority matters and goals. Another relevant idea is currently debated at NATO – the increase of common funding. Bulgaria and many other countries support the idea of common funding and they have a good reason for that. The requirements for deployment or expedition forces are the same for all, but they don't match the number of armed forces and the resources of the individual countries. Some requirements are set as proportions from the total number of armed forces – those for land troops - 40 % and deployment forces - 8 %, for instance. Others, however, are not compatible to the standards and available resources of the individual states which places different burdens on these states' budgets. Bulgaria, for instance, has allotted 12 % of its defense budget for operations, but in purely financial terms this resource cannot meet the 8 % indicator required from Bulgaria and the other NATO members. Common NATO funding could be used to mitigate these disparities. It could cover a larger part of the

key activities common for the Alliance. Nevertheless, it shouldn't be expected that common funding by NATO or any other organization could fully replace funding from national budgets. This is the reason why practical priorities with tangible effects must be discussed again and again.

Old NATO members also have to take these approaches into consideration since not all of them are equally prepared to meet the new challenges. They are all the more important for the new and the aspiring members with much more work on their hands. It wouldn't be politically, and even psychologically, right to think that our NATO entry does it all because in reality we have ways to go to full preparedness. Accession is just a good start that should be followed by intense work and dedication.

The functions of NATO and the EU to the current problems of Southeast Europe are also worth discussing. Their roles shouldn't overlap, but along with this the ESDP is developed on the same founding principles and with the same capabilities as NATO's or even with NATO's own capabilities as in the Berlin Plus arrangements. The initial success of Berlin Plus in Macedonia and, hopefully, in Bosnia must be developed further. EU's advantage is that it has a wide range of crisis-management procedures. NATO is also striving to enlarge its crisis-management approaches, including collaboration in some civil aspects of the crises, readiness to react to situations similar to the Kosovo crisis in March, riot policing, and generally functions characteristic of the police and gendarmerie forces. The EU is still building its defense and security mechanisms, but I think it should try to increasingly include in these mechanisms non-member states as well, especially the ones whose membership is pending. This necessity is motivated by practical considerations as has become clear also from operation Altea. From the start of 2005 Bulgaria will provide 3 % of the forces in operation Altea, while the share of all non-EU forces in it is 1/6 of the whole personnel.

Finally, from the perspective of the relatively new challenges Southeast Europe and the Western Balkans may be considered as a test for NATO and the EU. It is commonly considered today that Afghanistan is the testing ground of what NATO can do today globally and this is so. Why is then Southeast Europe important? I think the fact that the new challenges were first fought there is a sufficient reason to probe the methods and techniques of counteraction in the same region. It is in Southeast Europe that integration processes can be tested for their stability effect. Southeast Europe is thus a region where NATO and the EU can face the full spectrum of challenges – from the enlargement process, i.e. states on the threshold of meeting accession standards, to crisis-management issues in post-conflict environment which has turned out to be the most problematic phase of conflicts. The right approach, I think, is for NATO and the EU to step up their influence and involvement and for all of us to join our efforts for the solution of our Southeast European problems. Thank you very much!



Dragan Djurović
Deputy Prime Minister and
Minister of Interior of Montenegro

*Mr. Chairman,
Dear Ministers,
Ladies and Gentlemen,*

I have the honor and pleasure to greet you and thank our hosts for the organization of this conference which will certainly contribute to even better cooperation of our countries in fighting against all forms of security risks, which we unfortunately face every day.

Contrary to the Cold War period, when the main threat to security was clear, security threat today is instable and constantly changing. From a security point of view, the Cold War called for the so-called “hard” security measures, which were mainly based on a short-term resolution of single problems by employing weapons. This approach was actually a reaction to events, without dealing with their root causes. The Cold War was followed by a period of globalization. The term widely used today is “soft” security, which implies a more systematic approach to the security problem, as well as search for a long-term solution for its cause. In this way, instead of merely reacting to problems, we try to work on their prevention.

Within the context of changing security threats and challenges at the global level and in Southeast Europe, the structure, means and priorities of the key European and Euro-Atlantic security structures, and primarily of NATO, have also changed.

As a consequence, NATO gave up its Cold War structure and confronted the new threats and challenges of the modern era. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is based on mutual security guarantees and commitment to the principle of collective defense which is reflected in Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty, but nevertheless, NATO gathered enough strength to recognize the new situation and adapt to it. If once the priority of NATO was the Cold War, today its priority is definitely “hot peace”.

Terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass-destruction are primarily recognized as new threats, as are the production of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons and defense from cyber terrorism.

NATO changed its traditional focus on Europe by employing its forces also outside the old continent. Its aim is to establish rapid availability of forces, where and when it is necessary, to act efficiently in all types of operations and interoperable communication, that is, compatibility of the command and control systems.

What is particularly important is that NATO continued to spread further to the East – seven East European countries have joined the 19-member Alliance this year. NATO and Russia established new partnership in the form of NATO-Russia Council. NATO-Ukraine Council, as well as the Mediterranean Dialogue were also established.

Since seven countries from the Vilnius Group joined the Alliance, three Balkan countries – Croatia, Albania and Macedonia launched an initiative which includes joint cooperation in the process of accession to NATO. The initiative was named the Adriatic Group and it resulted in signing the Adriatic Charter. This Charter, above all, promotes regional cooperation with the aim of assisting the Western Balkans countries to join NATO as soon as possible. As you know, Serbia and Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina wish to join NATO's Partnership for Peace Program as soon as possible, and in that context, our wish is to join the group of countries gathered around this Charter.

Montenegro fully welcomes immediate and unconditional fulfillment of all requirements before Serbia and Montenegro in order to join Partnership for Peace and NATO. We strongly believe that it is necessary to fully cooperate with the Hague Tribunal without any reservation or postponing. We have the same position when it comes to other conditions needed for our membership in Partnership for Peace.

I am convinced that there are a lot of advantages of our desired membership in NATO: increased security, contribution to the stability within the region, improved and better organized military forces. That also means participation in the decision-making process in terms of important strategic security decisions and reduction of the possibility of conflicts because NATO membership practically integrates conflicts.

The EU, on the other hand, also had to adapt to the new security architecture, so in the past several years it has significantly developed its security and defense policy (ESDP).

Important steps have been made in establishing rapid reaction forces and the EU will also have autonomous capacity for military planning. As result of this, I have the pleasure to conclude that the EU has already successfully taken over missions in Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and successfully completed its mission in Kongo.

Future development of ESDP will mostly depend on the development of a common foreign and security policy of the EU. Europe will need years of investments and training in order to achieve the desired level of defense, but I am sure that it is going in the right direction.

I am convinced that by the development of ESDP the EU did not establish an organization which is going to compete with NATO, but to complement it. Bearing in mind the unpredictable and mobile character of the security threats today I am sure that there is enough room for both NATO and ESDP within Southeast Europe. Therefore, mutual cooperation is of key importance and nobody should be excluded since we are all equally in danger. We must not allow that security in Europe becomes political, but existential issue, which will be best solved by multilateral approach and agreement.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is clear that the biggest security threat that we face today is terrorism. Although terrorism can be an individual act, most commonly it stands for organized violence supported behind the scenes by some political or other organizations, or even states.

The attack on the USA by radical Islamic terrorists in September 2001 and the beginning of the global war against terrorism resulted in total change in the security panorama in the world and in a new era in the understanding of the concept of security. In this new era of terrorism it is hard to identify an enemy and security threat is mobile and asymmetric in relation to its target. Today, terrorism represents an attack on our stable and deep-rooted values. It has a huge capacity of destruction, especially in view of the easy access to new technologies. Terrorism is most efficient when it is unexpected and when it affects people's minds and imagination, making them feel insecure. Thus, the extent of the psychological effect of the terrorist act becomes more effective than the act itself.

Terrorism is a phenomenon of great media, political and expert attention and analyses. The latest events, with terrorists using the power of electronic media and the Internet, attest that the fight against this evil must be continued and extended because terrorists keep on inventing new ways to perform their wicked acts. Experience teaches us that terrorism, as a global phenomenon, is closely connected to organized crime and all its manifestations. Organized crime, together with corruption, which opens the door for organized crime, represents a threat to the rule of law and to social prosperity in general. Organized crime ignores boundaries, which makes it a problem of the countries of Southeast Europe, Western Europe, or any other part of the world.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Montenegro is a small country in terms of its size and population, but at the same time it is a country with a very important geo-strategic position and an exit to the Adriatic Sea. In spite of its economic burden as a transition country, Montenegro is doing its best in order to contribute to common security on the global as well on the regional level.

Montenegro does not plan to rely predominantly on military forces for its security in the future, but rather on modern and competent police forces. Montenegrin police forces have already taken up a very important and responsible task of guarding Montenegrin borders. Our goal is to have police forces using modern, NATO-compatible equipment and standards, and to be interoperable with the NATO forces. The security of the Adriatic Sea is also of key importance for the security of the whole region. Montenegro's immediate task is securing the so-called "blue border" on the Adriatic Sea and Skadar Lake with our police forces. For this purpose, we soon plan to set up Coast Guard.

We soon intend to draft and adopt a Strategy of National Security. This should be a core document dealing with possible security threats for Montenegro and the ways to deal with them. In this context, I would like to underline that the issue of

national security and internal affairs is in the exclusive competence of Montenegro in accordance with the Constitutional Charter of the state union.

Montenegro strives for urgent reform and modernization of the Army and complete civilian control over it. Aiming to enable the full civilian control over the Army, we fully support the abolition of military courts and the transfer of their competences to civilian ones.

Our priority in fighting against terrorism and organized crime is successful protection of borders, monitoring the flow of persons and goods across land and sea borders, as well as modernization of travel documents and computer and intelligence networking with the aim to exchange information in this field. We fully support the introduction of the concept of “smart borders”, that is, borders which will allow undisturbed and fast flow of persons and goods, but at the same time reinforce the border security measures.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to stress that the strategic interest of the Republic of Montenegro is European and Euro-Atlantic integration and compliance with the highest international standards in all fields. In that sense, our priority is membership in EU and membership in NATO's Program Partnership for Peace, and consequently, the full membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We are implementing all necessary reforms with this goal in mind. It is our strong belief that only after all our countries become part of the common security structures the security prospect of Montenegro and the Region as a whole will be completed.

I would like to stress once again that Montenegro is doing its best in order to contribute to global security. We will continue to improve our capacities in hope that if we all do our share, we will be able to eradicate problems which represent the biggest threat to security and stability in the world at the beginning of the 21st Century.

In that sense I wish to underline Montenegro's commitment to better cooperation within the region. I see conferences like this as very important and I wish to take the opportunity to greet you again and thank you for your attention.



Prof. Georgi Petkanov
Minister of Interior of Bulgaria

*Ladies and Gentlemen,
Dear Colleagues and Guests,*

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to take part in the international security conference organized by the Center for the Study of Democracy. The conference will undoubtedly benefit from the attendance of high-level NATO and EU officials, SEE ministers of defense and interior, representatives of key international organisations and diplomatic missions, the academia and the non-governmental sector.

Due to its NATO membership and pending accession to the EU Bulgaria has now a unique chance of making its security structures an integral part of the Euro-Atlantic and European ones. Since the 1990s globalization has been the single factor that most crucially determines international relations. The growing interdependence between states has essentially changed the way national interests are to be defended. Throughout this period the international security scene has undergone radical transformations. New trends are appearing. Central and Eastern Europe have been part of the integration process. Bulgaria is a NATO member and is shortly to become an EU member.

Against this backdrop we can state with some certainty that in the mid and long term perspective the Republic of Bulgaria is not facing the risk of a classical war threat. Following September 11, however, the international community has had to revise its priorities and to take steps to strengthen the international legal instruments, institutions and mechanisms that would guarantee the world peace and security.

Bulgaria has accordingly introduced legislative and organizational measures to adapt its security services to the requirements of NATO and the EU. We have reformed the National Security Service (NSS) and rather than being a Soviet-style special service, it is now structured after similar agencies in NATO countries. Pursuant to Bulgaria's international commitments NSS' topmost priority is the sound coordination with foreign security agencies in counteracting international terrorism and trans-border organized crime.

Two strategic laws have been adopted: the Law on the Protection of Classified Information and the Amendments to the Law on the Ministry of Interior establishing the NSS' responsibilities in the national system for the protection of classified information. Some new legal amendments are being prepared that will make the NSS a unified nation-wide agency.

Ladies and Gentlemen, NATO is the primary guarantor of Euro-Atlantic security, so Bulgaria's membership in the Alliance is a strong guarantee of its national security. Its next enlargement would bring further security to our environment and will make the Alliance stronger and abler to affect the level of security. The open-door policy and the ensuing enlargement with new SEE members will turn the region into an area of common security and stability.

The integration of more countries within the alliance has markedly enhanced security cooperation. Security and law-enforcement services are functioning in this new environment and have to face its challenges. The location of SEE countries along some major illegal goods and drug trafficking routes puts them at imminent risk from trans-border organized criminal activities.

Bulgaria's unequivocal support to and participation in the international anti-terrorist coalition make the country a potential target of terrorist activities as well, especially as it is geographically close to regions like the Middle East and the Caucasus. Contemporary terrorist organizations present a much greater threat to any state's social, economic, and political fabric since they can get hold of weapons for mass destruction (WMD).

Immigration flows from the conflict-ridden Central Asian countries are also posing security risks. The Bulgarian law-enforcement agencies with the Ministry of Interior (MoI), and of course their counterparts in the EU states, are increasingly involved in prevention and counteraction of illegal migration and human trafficking.

The risks from illicit trading in arms and dual-use goods and technologies have not lessened either. The MoI is fully aware that the most severe threat to international security nowadays is the possibility of terrorist groups to acquire and use WMD. This makes illicit arms trafficking a major problem that needs to be tackled decisively. Fighting international terrorism is a priority for the Bulgarian MoI and it implements a number of measures following the clear-cut state policy of active support to the anti-terrorist coalition and the UN Security Council's resolutions on terrorism.

The MoI and its agencies are fully equipped for integration into EU and NATO security structures and are drawing on these partners' expertise to counteract the risks and threats to national security more effectively. We are building an institutional capacity that will allow us to respond properly to the new terrorist and organized crime risks both on a national and trans-national scale. The MoI's primary task is to ensure better coordination between the special services, the police, the judiciary, the local authorities, and the emergency services. The country's security can best be guarded through information exchange that will provide early warning and through the synchronized efforts of all agencies.

Special and law-enforcement agencies use non-military prevention measures to safeguard national security and the constitutional order. The early warning information collected by Bulgarian security services as part of their role in international crisis management and peace-keeping operations is rising in importance.

The MoI is cooperating with all Balkan security services to tackle trans-border organized crime. There is a constant regional information exchange on illegal human trafficking, goods smuggling, psychotropic and radioactive substance trafficking, arms and ammunitions smuggling, terrorist activities and hazardous cargo incidents.

The areas where the MoI has gained considerable ground with the support of its US and EU partners are: interception of drug trafficking, illicit synthetic drugs production and distribution, and counterfeited money and documents. MoI services are successfully implementing joint projects with the British government and Europol targeting trafficking in women and people smuggling in general.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is more than certain that contemporary security threats can only be fought through concerted efforts with our partners from NATO and the EU. We have set the full integration with Euro-Atlantic and EU police and special services as our primary goal because it will help Bulgaria provide adequate response to the new common risks and security threats.

Together we will succeed. Thank you very much.



Dr. Vlado Buchkovski
Minister of Defense of the Republic of Macedonia

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me at the beginning of my remarks to express my satisfaction for the extended opportunity to have an address at this important conference and to present and share my views regarding the issues of building and strengthening peace within the context of the NATO contribution to the stability and security and the new role of the European Union. We may agree that this conference takes place at a very important moment when the region of Southeast Europe is dominated by positive integration initiatives and processes as a foundation of democracy, stability, security and economic prosperity but also in a period when we face real challenges and asymmetric threats to the security. There is no state in the region that can be immune to that and it will be faced with the burden of the successful fight against:

- possible manifestation of extreme nationalism, racial intolerance, religious hatred, international terrorism, organized crime, illicit migration of all kind including the trafficking of strategic and dual-use materials, insufficiently secured and safe borders etc.
- availability of large quantities of illicit weapons, transitional problems as: corruption, urban terrorism, economic crime, tax evasion etc.
- activities of the foreign special services directed towards deteriorating of the security, consequences from the collision of interests on utilization of sources and means of strategic resources, elemental or other kind of catastrophes, computer crime with damaging consequences and destruction of the natural environment.

The assessment on the absence of conventional threats to the countries of the region and the presence of non-conventional and global asymmetric threats strengthens the commitment for regional engagement and engagement within the Alliance. In line with the Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the open doors policy of NATO gives an opportunity for accession to each country and thus enabling the contribution to building the security environment at local, regional and global level. That process not only gives excellent results in strengthening the stability and security of the member states of the Alliance, but also has the same effect on the aspiring countries. NATO, being the cornerstone of transatlantic security system, with its last enlargement as well as with the future accession of new members including Macedonia, will expand the stability and security zone and will contribute to the peace, stability and world's wellbeing.

Today, Europe is building and enhancing the democracy and free institutions under the security umbrella of NATO. The countries from Western Europe and North America acknowledged the concept "Security is the oxygen of progress" and they themselves achieved significant results in that direction. This is the reason that is to be the driving force in the sector of security reforms in Southeast Europe. The membership to NATO and EU is the vital interest and strategic goal to the countries of the region that see no other alternatives. NATO is the only efficient political, defence and security organization that in the past 50 years safeguarded the basic values: democracy, market economy and human rights-values shared also by the Republic of Macedonia and its citizens. The Alliance proved its efficacy in promoting the peace and stability with its missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Afghanistan. During the past years the Alliance gave a significant contribution in providing security to the Republic of Macedonia.

Considering security threats and risks, there is no state that can respond to the security challenges by itself alone, especially to those of asymmetric character, including the global terrorism, weapons proliferation, illicit migration, trafficking in humans, drugs trafficking, organized crime, consequences from natural disasters and other types of contingencies. In that context, each country from the region of Southeast Europe must plan the defence and protect its own interests and at the same time to make contribution to the Alliance in a realistic and constructive way. In that respect one must have in mind the fact that the Alliance is a global security system that at present and in future will assume duties beyond its boundaries(not only in regard with the Article 5) for the benefit of the global peace and stability.

During the past years, the Republic of Macedonia has shown its firm determination to become a NATO member. Republic of Macedonia considers the full-fledged membership to the Alliance as its best security option and therefore outlines all future plans on the basis of its future membership to the NATO. However, in planning its future, Republic of Macedonia is fully aware that the membership and the accession to the collective security guarantees go along with the duties and responsibilities. In that sense, Republic of Macedonia considers its own stability and security as an important factor for the stability and security of the region. In that respect, the Macedonian defence reforms are one of the top priorities of our Government. The global and regional activities of my country in accomplishing a level of equal participant in the common security with the Alliance and its partners are focused on development of capabilities for active contribution to the collective security and participation to peace missions led by the Alliance. The global activities Republic of Macedonia assumes in regard to NATO includes the active involvement in the anti terrorist coalition and appropriate preparedness of the system institution and anti terrorist forces as well as considering the areas of possible participation in the defence capabilities of the Alliance and the region. As part of the process of global efforts in countering terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, Republic of Macedonia participates in the Iraqi Freedom mission with one special units platoon and is part of the ISAF mission in Afghanistan by continuing its participation with an enhanced army detachment. Our experience in Afghanistan and Iraq has shown us that we should concentrate our efforts in developing new capabilities. In order to become effective members of the Alliance, we must make a contribution through development of niche capabilities and to share the burden with our allies at all levels. But above all, we must be interoperable.

In the past period, besides the significant progress made in the regional security cooperation with Albania and Croatia according to the successful model of the Baltic and Nordic States, enviable results are achieved in the cooperation with Republic of Bulgaria and Romania being new NATO members that we see as our lobbyists for integration to the Alliance. Republic of Macedonia, in the spirit of the regional cooperation is ready to extend its full support to Serbia and Montenegro in its path towards membership to the Partnership for Peace. Security stabilization of Kosovo, advancement of all democratic standards of citizens and institutions and the resolution of the final status of Kosovo by means of negotiations between Pristina and Belgrade with the active involvement of the international community are issues of special importance to the international community and my country as well.

In all these activities of regional cooperation and bilateral agreements in the area of security and defence, the Republic of Macedonia sees an opportunity that will enable:

- high level mutual confidence among neighbors and mutual understanding regarding the major security issues in the region;
- raised awareness for the regional situation by means of exchange of intelligence data
- development of complementary defence and security systems, considering the joint strategic goal of the countries of the region for NAT membership.

I think that this region has the capacity to take all the countries into an era of common understanding and mutual confidence. Nowadays, the initiatives for regional cooperation, especially in the area of defence and security are needed more than ever in this part of Europe and in that regard the exchange of experiences and creating partnership relations are significant contribution in strengthening peace and confidence in the region of Southeast Europe.

I would like to complete my remarks with a message we conveyed to our NATO partners that the Balkan countries will not be only long-term users of security guarantees and financial assistance but also they can be significant contributors in defence, economic and political potential and fresh thinking on some issues of the Euro-Atlantic and global security.

MEDIA COVERAGE

MONITOR daily	Bulgarian Troops will be Deployed in Afghanistan as well 30 October 30, 2004
SEGA daily	Bulgaria Sends Soldiers in Afghanistan 30 October, 2004
STANDART daily	Bulgarians will Teach Senior Military Officers in Iraq 30 October, 2004
24 HOURS daily	Investments Multiplied by 4 in the last 2 years 30 October, 2004
TRUD daily	NATO Sends our Troops out of Kabul 30 October, 2004
BULGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY (BTA)	NATO Deputy Secretary General is Visiting Sofia 29 October, 2004
BULGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY (BTA)	Bulgarian Troops to Secure the Airport in Kabul 29 October, 2004
BULGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY (BTA)	<i>Peaceful and Prosperous Balkans</i> is Supported by NATO and the EU 29 October, 2004
BULGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY (BTA)	An international conference titled <i>NATO, EU and the New Risks: a Southeast Europe Perspective</i> will be Opened Today in Boyana Conference Center 29 October, 2004
BULGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY (BTA)	Interior Minister Georgi Petkanov said the Law on Forfeiture of Property Acquired by Criminal Activity will be adopted by November 15 29 October, 2004
BULGARIAN NATIONAL RADIO	<i>Peaceful and Prosperous Balkans</i> is Supported by NATO and the EU 29 October, 2004
BULGARIAN NATIONAL RADIO	International Conference <i>NATO, EU and the New Risks</i> Takes Place in Sofia 29 October, 2004

- NEWS.BG** **International Conference NATO, EU and the New Risks Takes Place in Sofia**
29 October, 2004
- NEWS.BG** **Investments will Grow following the invitation in NATO**
29 October, 2004
- NEWS.BG** **Interior Minister Georgi Petkanov: the National Security Service has Abandoned the Soviet Model**
29 October, 2004
- NEWS.BG** **Macedonian Defense Minister Vlado Buchkovski: There is No State wich Can Defeat Terrorism Alone**
29 October, 2004
- DNEVNIK daily** **Vice-Premier Plamen Panayotov: the Balkan Countries are Fully Supported by NATO and the EU**
29 October 2004
- DNEVNIK daily** **NATO Contributes to the Rise of Investment in Bulgaria, says Plamen Panayotov**
29 October, 2004
- DNEVNIK daily** **NATO Deputy Secretary General Arrives Today**
29 October, 2004
- VSEKIDEN.COM** **Bulgaria sends more Rangers to Afghanistan**
29 October, 2004
- BGNES.BG** **Defense Minister Nikolay Svinarov: Organized Crime became International**
29 October, 2004
- AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE (AFP)** **Bulgarian troops to protect Kabul airport in 2006**
29 October, 2004
- NOVINITE.COM** **Bulgaria's NATO Entry Results in Boosted Investments**
29 October, 2004
- AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE (AFP)** **NATO deputy chief supports decentralization in Macedonia**
28 October, 2004
- ASSOCIATED PRESS (AP)** **Terrorism, corruption and organized crime are the main threats in SEE**
28 October, 2004

**BULGARIAN
TELEGRAPH
AGENCY (BTA)**

**Vice-Premier Plamen Panayotov and NATO Deputy
Secretary General Alessandro Minuto Rizzo will take part
in an international conference in Boyana tomorrow
28 October, 2004**

PHOTOGRAPHS



Dr. Ognian Shentov, CSD Chairman, opens the conference. Next to him: Mr. Plamen Panayotov, Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria, Amb. Alessandro Minuto Rizzo, NATO Deputy Secretary General, Amb. Boyko Noev, CSD European Program Director, Mr. Nikolay Svinarov, Minister of Defense of Bulgaria and Mr. Dominick Chilcott, Director, EU Policy, UK Foreign Office



First panel: NATO's contribution to stability and security and the new challenges. EU's new role in SEE security



First panel, from left: Mr. Plamen Panayotov, Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria, Amb. Alessandro Minuto Rizzo, NATO Deputy Secretary General, Amb. Boyko Noev, CSD European Program Director, Mr. Nikolay Svinarov, Minister of Defense of Bulgaria and Mr. Dominick Chilcott, Director, EU Policy, UK Foreign Office



Press conference of Amb. Minuto Rizzo, NATO Deputy Secretary General (left) and Mr. Plamen Panayotov, Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria



First panel (continued). *From left:* Dr. Emil Tsenkov, Director, Information Centre on the Council of Europe, Amb. Lyubomir Ivanov, Bulgaria's Mission in NATO and Amb. Michael Sahlin, EU Special Representative in Macedonia



Second panel. *From left:* Mr. Dragan Djurović, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Interior of Montenegro, Lieut. Gen. (ret.) Chavdar Chervenkov, Senior Expert, CSD, Mr. Dragan Jočić, Minister of Interior of Serbia and Lieut. Gen. Atanas Zaprianov, Deputy-Chief of the Bulgarian General Staff



Second panel (continued). *From left:* Prof. Georgi Petkanov, Minister of Interior of Bulgaria, Dr. Vlado Buchkovski, Minister of Defense of Macedonia, Maj. Gen. Holger Sammet, Assistant Director IMS NATO, Planning and Policy, Mr. Zamfir Geanta, Deputy Director, General Inspectorate, Border Police, Romania and Mr. Aurel Georgescu, Liaison Officer, Embassy of Romania



Third panel. *From left:* Prof. Georgi Petkanov, Minister of Interior of Bulgaria, Mr. Boyko Kotsev, Deputy Minister of Interior, Dr. Dimitar Yonchev, Chairman, Balkan Security Forum, Ms. Elizabeth Pond, Editor, Transatlantic Internationale Politik and Lieut. Gen. (ret.) Anyu Angelov, Chairman, Center for the Study of National Security

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Institution
Alessandro Minuto Rizzo	Ambassador, NATO Deputy Secretary General
Alexandru Matache	Police Agent, Romania
Anju Angelov	Lieut. Gen. (ret.), Chairman, Center for the Study of National Security, Bulgaria
Arild Sande	Deputy Head of Mission, Royal Norwegian Embassy
Assen Assenov	Director, Customs Agency, Bulgaria
Atanas Zapryanov	Lieut.-Gen., Deputy Chief of General Staff of the Bulgarian Armed Forces
Aurel Georgescu	Liaison Officer, Embassy of Romania
Avgustina Tsvetkova	Secretary General, Atlantic Club in Bulgaria
Bertil Roth	Ambassador, Embassy of Sweden
Blagoja Markovski	Colonel, Advisor to the Minister of Defense of Macedonia
Boyko Kotzev	Deputy Minister of Interior, Bulgaria
Boyko Noev	Amb., Director, European Program, Center for the Study of Democracy
Boyko Todorov	Program Director, Center for the Study of Democracy
Bozhidar Ganev	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria

Name	Institution
Čedomir Radojkovic	Ambassador, Embassy of Serbia and Montenegro
Chavdar Chervenkov	Gen. (ret.), Senior Expert, European Program, Center for the Study of Democracy
Christo Manchev	Deputy Chief Prosecutor, Chairman, Supreme Cassation Prosecutor's Office, Bulgaria
Constantin Cakioussis	Political Advisor to the EU Special Representative in Macedonia
David Wolstenholme	Pre-Accession Advisor, Ministry of Interior of Bulgaria
Denis Skubic	Senior Adviser, Ministry of Defense of Croatia
Denislava Simeonova	Project Coordinator, European Program Center for the Study of Democracy
Dessislava Velinova	Chief Expert, NATO and International Security Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria
Dimitar Dimitrov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Dimitar Mirin	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Dimitar Yonchev	Dr., Chairman, Balkan Security Forum, Bulgaria
Dobri Dobrev	Military Information Directorate Ministry of Defense of Bulgaria
Dominick Chilcott	Director, EU Policy, UK Foreign Office
Dragan Djurović	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Internal Affairs of Montenegro
Dragan Jočić	Minister of Interior of Serbia
Dragana Radulovic	Foreign Policy Advisor to the Minister of Internal Affairs of Montenegro

Name	Institution
Elislav Ivanov	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Elizabeth Pond	Editor, Transatlantic Internationale Politik, Germany
Emil Tsenkov	Dr., Director, Information Centre on the Council of Europe, Bulgaria
Emil Yonchev	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Evgeni Manev	Maj. Gen., Commandant Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Fulya Yucekok	Third Secretary, Embassy of Turkey
Gancho Ganev	Ambassador, Embassy of Bulgaria in Norway
Gene Gibson	Senior Advisor, Rule of Law & Governance, USAID/ Bulgaria
Georgi Dankov	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Georgi Petkanov	Prof., Minister of Interior of Bulgaria
Georgi Stoyanov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Gian B. Campagnola	Ambassador, Embassy of Italy
Gordan Čačić	Brig. General, Head of Military Security Agency Ministry of Defense of Croatia
Haidar Berk	Ambassador, Embassy of Turkey
Holger Sammet	Gen. Maj., Assistant Director, Planning and Policy Division, NATO International Military Secretariat
Ilko Dimitrov	Deputy Minister of Defense of Bulgaria

Name	Institution
Ivan Ivanov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Ivan Sotirov	Advisor to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria
Jelena Grčić Polić	Dr, Assistant Minister for Defense Policy Ministry of Defense of Croatia
Jeremy Hill	Ambassador, Embassy of the United Kingdom
Kerin Hope	Financial Times
Krassimir Alexiev	Chief Investigator, First Sofia Investigation Service
Krassimir Monovski	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Kristina Tepkyan	Third Secretary, Embassy of Russia
Laurence Broyd	Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of the United Kingdom
Ljiljana Tanasijević	Counsellor for consular affairs Embassy of Serbia and Montenegro
Lyubisha Georgievski	Ambassador, Embassy of Macedonia
Lyubomir Ivanov	Ambassador, Bulgarian Mission to NATO
Lyudmil Angelov	National Intelligence Service, Bulgaria
Manol Bonev	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Maria Videlova	Member, State Commission on Information Security, Bulgaria
Marjan Gjurovski	Spokesman, Ministry of Defense of Macedonia

Name	Institution
Mark Warlow	Deputy Defense Attaché, Embassy of the United Kingdom
Mate Raboteg	State Secretary, Ministry of Defense of Croatia
Michael Sahlin	Ambassador, EU Special Representative in Macedonia
Mihail Rosianu	Ambassador, Embassy of Romania
Mila Georgieva	Prosecutor, Supreme Cassation Prosecutor's Office, Bulgaria
Mladen Chervenjakov	Member of Parliament, Bulgaria
Natalia Bekyarova	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Natalia Dimitrova	Secretary, <i>Coalition 2000</i> , Bulgaria
Natasa Petrusić	Chief of Bureau for International Cooperation Ministry of Interior of Serbia
Neil Buhne	Resident Representative, UNDP-Bulgaria
Nikolay Svinarov	Minister of Defense of Bulgaria
Ognian Shentov	Dr., Chairman, Center for the Study of Democracy
Pentcho Houbtchev	Program Coordinator, Friedrich Ebert Foundation, Bulgaria
Philip Gounev	Research Fellow, Center for the Study of Democracy
Plamen Bonchev	Director, NATO and International Security Directorate Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria
Plamen Panayotov	Deputy Prime Minister of Bulgaria

Name	Institution
Rolf Baltzersen	Ambassador, Royal Norwegian Embassy
Roumen Markov	Col., Dr., Rector, Academy of the Ministry of Interior of Bulgaria
Roumen Milanov	Maj.Gen., Director, National Service for Protection, Bulgaria
Roumen Stoilov	Deputy Minister of Interior, Bulgaria
Ruslan Stefanov	Project Coordinator, Economic Program Center for the Study of Democracy
Saša Mončinovic	Third Secretary, Embassy of Croatia
Slavomir Dobrowa	Ambassador, Embassy of Poland
Stefan Sofianski	Mayor of Sofia
Stoyan Tomchev	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Stoyanka Petrova	Chief Coordinator Diplomatic Institute, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria
Tatyana Doncheva	MP, Member, Internal Security and Public Order Committee, National Assembly of Bulgaria
Teodor Troev	Financial Times
Todor Tchourov	Director, Human Rights and International Humanitarian Organizations Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria
Tsveta Markova	Chair, State Commission on Information Security, Bulgaria
Valentin Radomirski	Arsenal, Bulgaria
Valentin Stankov	Prof., Balkan Security Forum, Bulgaria

Name	Institution
Valeri Ivanov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Valeri Ratchev	Col., Deputy Commandant Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Vanyo Assenov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Vladko Vladov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Vlado Buchkovski	Dr., Minister of Defense of Macedonia
Vlado Sindler	Colonel, Deputy Head of J-5 General Staff of the Croatian Armed Forces
Yordan Velitchkov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Yulii Yanachkov	Col., Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Zahari Zahariev	Col., Chief of First Regional Police Department – Sofia
Zamfir Geanta	Police Principal Quaestor, Deputy Chief General Inspectorate of the Border Police, Romania
Zdravcho Alexandrov	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria
Zdravko Vidinski	Rakovski Defense and Staff College, Bulgaria

