

Russia constituted a security threat for Russia and for the CSCE as a whole; however, many states had concerns about legitimizing the presence of Russian forces in the "near abroad" by covering them with a CSCE mandate. Several delegations suggested that criteria should be developed for accepting CIS peacekeeping under CSCE auspices. Others were sceptical about developing criteria and preferred a case-by-case approach. Canada argued that certain basic principles had to be respected for the CSCE to give support to any third-party intervention, i.e. the consent of the parties had to be given, the impartiality of the peacekeepers had to be assured, and there had to be a political process underway that the peacekeeping operation would support. Beyond this, the degree of CSCE involvement should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Ministers decided that the issue should be further considered by CSCE delegations in Vienna. They did, however, agree that the CSCE mission in Georgia should elaborate "possible arrangements for liaison with joint Georgian, Russian and Ossetian peacekeeping forces with a view to establishing more comprehensive monitoring and oversight."

With a view to improving the CSCE's efficiency, Ministers decided to replace the Vienna Group with the "Permanent Committee" of the CSCE in Vienna. The Permanent Committee would have enhanced decision-making authority and be responsible for day-to-day operational tasks of the CSCE, including dispatching conflict management missions. The intention was that the CSO could then become what its name implied: a high-level body of officials from capitals meeting three or four times a year to take strategic policy decisions. The CPC Consultative Committee was dissolved and its functions allocated to the Permanent Committee and the FSC. In addition, the Secretariat became a single structure concentrated in Vienna, with the ODIHR in Warsaw and a small conference secretariat in Prague also reporting to the Secretary General in Vienna. Canada was particularly pleased with the decision to create the Permanent Committee -- a permanent body for ongoing political consultation, decisions and operational tasks across the spectrum of CSCE activities -- and hoped that the institutional changes mandated at Rome would result in a more effective, action-oriented CSCE.

### The Human Dimension

Canada continued to believe that conflict prevention at its most basic level had to begin with the full implementation of CSCE commitments, particularly with regard to democratic development, the rule of law and respect for human and minority rights. One of main problems facing the CSCE was that participating states had endlessly reiterated the fundamental importance of observing commitments but then did not appear to pay attention to what they had said. Canada believed that participating states should be more vigilant and outspoken in drawing attention to violations of human dimension commitments. It advocated more frequent use of the human dimension mechanism, more follow-up to the seminars organized by the ODIHR, and more resources for the HCNM, who was dealing with minority issues in Estonia, Latvia, Slovakia, Romania, Hungary, Albania and the FYR Macedonia and was proving to be quite effective in his early warning role. Canada also thought that the Vienna Group could pay regular attention to human dimension issues.

The Rome Council's consideration of the human dimension followed closely upon the recommendations of the Implementation Meeting on Human Dimension Issues, held from