



EUROPEAN UNION PRESIDENCY SEMINAR ON SECURITY SECTOR REFORM (SSR) IN THE WESTERN BALKANS

13 – 14th February 2006

SEMINAR REPORT

The European Union Presidency Seminar on Security Sector Reform (SSR) in the Western Balkans was co-organised by the Austrian Ministry of Defence and the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs together with the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EU-ISS) and the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF). This two day Seminar was held from 13th to 14th of February at the Hilton Hotel in Vienna

The conference was attended by nearly two hundred participants from EU member states, candidate states, and from the Western Balkans; the EU Council, the EU Commission, and the European Parliament; the Stability Pact, OSCE, NATO, OECD, UNDP, RACVIAC and research institutes.

This report summarizes the prepared remarks presented by speakers in the four panels as well as the essential contributions of the working groups and the discussions. This report has to be seen as a descriptive one and is structured according to the chronological order of the seminar.



Introductory statements

Brigadier Wolfgang Wosolsobe, Defence Policy Director, Austrian Ministry of Defence, welcomed the participants of the seminar and announced the continuation of EU's SSR activities launched during the British EU Presidency.

In his speech, **Günther Platter, Austrian Federal Minister of Defence**, stressed that Security Sector Reform was one of the most important issues of the Austrian EU Presidency. He emphasised that Austria was prepared to transfer its long-term experience with the Western Balkans to further enhance the SSR activities of the European Union in the region. The support for SSR in the Western Balkans as well as for the process of ongoing rapprochement towards the European Union was confirmed by the Austrian EU Presidency. As one of the major concerns Minister Platter expressed that the conceptual basis, developed within the framework of the first and second pillar of the EU had to be consorted as far as possible. Therefore he highlighted that a comprehensive approach to Security Sector Reform was of paramount importance.

Judy Batt, Senior Research Fellow at the European Institute for Security Studies, was assigned to provide a conference report. Judy Batt accentuated the significance of the Food for Thought Paper by DCAF. She mentioned the issue of "coherence" which should be at the centre of the EU's effort as well as "capacity building" and "democratization". The Western Balkans countries are serving as a testing ground for an approach to global SSR by the EU. Furthermore, she remarked that it was important to look at what had already been achieved.

Theodor Winkler, Director of the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, mentioned that there was a significant link between SSR and the attraction of investment which further leads to development. He agreed with many other speakers on the importance of comprising many aspects of SSR: border management, police reform, intelligence reform and parliamentary oversight. He also highlighted that the perspective of EU membership was the strongest incentive.



Key Note Addresses

Pedro Serrano, Director for Civilian Crisis Management in the Council Secretariat, explained that despite of certain shortcomings things “have been moving in the right direction” during the last five years. He expressed that a broad view on SSR was required encompassing various sectors even human rights, gender issues. He then pointed out the significance of coordination and demonstrated the variety of EU instruments to tackle the issue of SSR. Furthermore, he stressed that bilateral programmes of member states should not be neglected and that there is a need for an inter-pillar approach whereby even the third pillar is of importance. Although a comprehensive view is essential, a tailored approach is needed.

In his concluding remarks he mentioned three issues to be improved:

- Concepts and political will have to be met with resources – especially human resources.
- Economic and financial resources are vital
- An enhancement of coordination within the EU is important (common foreign minister)

Wolfgang Petritsch`s, Austrian Ambassador and former High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina, starting point was: the full transformation of security and law enforcement agencies into democratic and professional institutions is of paramount importance for long-term stability and economic development. He then elaborated that security sector management was an issue of governance as well as of government. In order to specify the meanings of SSR, he expressed that post conflict peace building was about the acronym DDR (Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration) of the armed forces – including para-military units and ad hoc “special forces”. Peace-building however was also about the reform of law enforcement and the thorough make-over of the legal system. He then demonstrated that SSR was clearly in a common European interest. To illustrate his findings, the example of Bosnia-Herzegovina was given. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the international community’s aim is to assist the country to devise an “entry strategy” into Europe. In



its efforts to reform the security sector, three security-relevant issues were addressed: Military, Law Enforcement and the Judiciary. Out of his practical experience, Ambassador Petritsch drew the conclusion, that SSR had to be based and driven by local ownership. Three main lessons against which the success of any SSR needed to be measured were demonstrated:

- How accountable governments become vis-à-vis their citizens and how reliable partners in the regions and beyond are
- How SSR will help to promote overall economic development in an increasingly interdependent environment.
- How SSR will contribute to enhance quality of life of the citizens.

PANEL I – Conceptual Basis for EU Security Sector Reform Activities

This Panel was chaired by **David Law**, Senior Research Fellow, who remarked a great consensus on the approach to SSR at the Seminar and reinforced that SSR was a precondition for democratic, economic and social development.

A Council Secretariat View

The approach of the Council Secretariat towards SSR was presented by **Roland Zinzius**, Deputy Head, Civil/Military Cell, EU Military Staff. He highlighted that SSR support required close cooperation and coordination between all EU actors as well as EU member states. The concept developed by the Council Secretariat was taking account of that. The key issues of Zinzius` presentation were:

- The ESS is an important basis for a theoretical approach towards SSR demonstrating the link between security in Europe and phenomena such as failed states, organised crime and terrorism.
- SSR is a complex issue for the EU because it is faced up with the own complexity of the EU (“soul searching process”). Consequently, an inter-pillar approach is



- needed accounting for the link between long-term development and crisis management.
- An improvement of coordination is needed not only implying coordination among EU actors but also among its member states, international financial institutions and the UN.
 - The conceptual aim of the EU should be the development of an overarching concept of SSR containing
 - a common definition of SSR,
 - key principles for SSR support
 - implementation guidelines:
 - e.g. case by case approach
 - early engagement
 - joint fact finding missions
 - establishment of a point of contact in the Council Secretariat and the EU Commission
 - Concerning the next steps for enhancing EU capabilities for SSR, the following activities were brought up: developing “this” overarching concept, raising awareness within EU states and EU institutions on SSR, keeping a constant eye on adequate financing, fulfilling the need for training of civilian or military expert teams, and suggesting to develop a DDR concept in parallel to SSR. To encapsulate, the most crucial task is enhancing the coherence of implementation.

A European Commission View

The European Commission’s point of view was presented by **Stefano Sannino**, Principal Adviser, DG RELEX, and European Commission Representative to the Political and Security Committee. Mr. Sannino agreed with Mr. Zinzinus on the need for better coordination and highlighted the importance of the use of synergies and complementarities. He then expressed that “inter pillar” differences were “far more created than substantial”.



He forecasted several elements of the EU Commission's concept on SSR: It will contain a definition of "what SSR is and of what it is not"; it will take account for the need for a holistic approach to SSR.

Sannino then argued that the EU had a comparative advantage in applying a holistic approach towards SSR because:

1. The EU is capable to combine assistance with a European perspective
2. The EU offers a global reach with its network encompassing Commission delegations, embassies of member states, EUSRs as well as ESDP operations.
3. The EU can combine short term action with long term peace building and development instruments
4. The EU has a good possibility to combine civilian and military capabilities; the civ/mil cell has to play a crucial role.
5. SSR programming goes downstream; this means it includes for example border management, certain parts of the justice system.

He then reported that the concept of the EU Commission took up the point of Comprehensive Planning; It tried to put forward a unified response by the EU towards the challenges of crises; SSR would then also entail Common Fact Finding Missions, a common framework, common plans of a comprehensive approach and common programming. In his conclusion, Mr. Sannino expressed that DG Relex found the contributions of this seminar and the various background papers very useful and would make use of it.

A Civil Society View

Paul Eavis, Director of Saferworld, focused his presentation on five key issues being elaborated at the UK EU Presidency Seminar on "Developing a Security Sector Reform (SSR) concept for the EU".

- Eavis agreed with previous speakers on the strong need for a single and holistic concept of SSR which includes common goals.



- Certain clarity on objectives is required. The EU should draw on the work already done by the OECD/DAC which provides a definition of SSR. Three elements are to be addressed: 1. nationally owned Security Concepts; 2. the need for good policies and strengthening of the governance of the SS; 3. Building the capacity for implementation.
- He then raised the issue of terminology and criticised the normally used term of SSR focusing too much on the military component. He suggested the term “security and justice sector development”
- Local ownership and partnership is essential! The work of the EU should be done on the basis of a dialogue.
- There is a certain need for increasing systematically the engagement of civil society actors! This is critical in order to meet the needs of the local population and maximise the EU’s potential.

In his conclusion he remarked that the EU had a huge potential for SSR. In order to maximise this potential, however, a coherent concept would be required.

Discussion

Not only the need for local ownership was stressed but also the proposal of introducing benchmarks was discussed. In the context of local ownership, the role of RACVIAC was mentioned as a positive example. The potential of RACVIAC for further increasing transparency and local responsibility was highlighted. In terms of similarities/dissimilarities of approaches between the Commission and Council, difficulties of implementation were underlined. The EU Commission’s concept might be available in March.

Panel II - SSR Perspectives from the Region – Security Concerns and Needs

The second panel of the seminar discussed the SSR from the view of the region. **Joseph Marko**, Professor of the Karl Franzens University Graz and chair of the panel, stressed that the countries in the region were still undergoing transformation.



Therefore, the states were on different levels of development and status issues had to be considered.

Zeljko Grubestic, Advisor for Defence and Security Matters, Parliamentary Assembly, Bosnia and Herzegovina, underlined that his country wanted to reach the standards for the EU accession, however, there remained a need for support from the EU to achieve this goal.

Stability, democratisation and regional and global integration are the necessary processes that **Bajram Ibraj**, General Director, State Police, Albania thinks that the International Community should foster. On the one hand, SSR is a tool that can help a country like Albania to prevent organised crime or economic problems. On the other hand, SSR needs to have an international perspective, because organised crime, human trafficking or terrorism does not know national borders. Therefore, it is important to establish a concept of prevention and to strengthen international cooperation on bilateral, multilateral and regional levels to increase the exchange of information and the speed of communication. Mr. Ibraj added that Albania already had a positive record of prevention of organised crime and terrorism.

Pavle Jankovic, President, International and Security Affairs Centre (ISAC) Serbia and Montenegro, claimed that there was a need for political will and courage in the region to do things that were not always popular in order to change values, standards and practices. The political will should be at the service of the political vision. Unconventional ideas were needed. A current obstacle to SSR was the fact that many countries concerned lack the financial capability, resources or economic power to form units for international operations. There should also be further cooperation between former enemies in civil protection, preparations for international operations, education and training and arms control. Joint exercises between the countries from the region should be possible.

The EU should offer the region:

- Clear standards that need to be reached in SSR
- The status of SSR should qualify countries to join the EU



- A South East European clearing house¹ would be a good idea
- Support for the civil sector for networking and confidence building, etc.

Nikola Pokopenko, Head of Courts and Public Prosecution Office, Ministry of Justice, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, stressed the importance of political stability and economic growth in the region. Therefore a comprehensive approach was needed to reform the whole justice system.

Discussion

A delegate stated that there were new challenges for the Western Balkans concerning the energy sector and organised crime. He inquired about the appropriate pace of reforms to meet these new challenges. Mr. Jankovic answered, that timing was important but the speed of the reform should not substitute the quality of the reform. The prime focus had to be on what needs to be accomplished.

Panel III – EU SSR Activities in the Western Balkans – Lessons Learned and Future Perspectives

This Panel was chaired by **Willem van Eekelen**, Senator, Dutch Parliament, former Secretary General of the WEU who expressed that the concept of SSR could be applied to a wide context and did not only refer to future member states of the EU. As crucial issues he raised the point of “confidence” and he stressed that SSR did not only cover the military but was related to “everybody in uniform”.

¹ South East Europe Clearinghouse is a US EUCOM – SVN Initiative; it is a multinational mechanism for the coordination between the requirements of the states of the region and the bi-/multilateral support of donor countries



Experience from Kosovo

Torbjörn Sohlström, Personal Representative of the EU SG/HR in Kosovo, shared his experience from Kosovo. He compared the situation of the SS in the region today with the situation of five years ago and noted that the situation had improved because the international community, especially the EU, had gradually understood that the functioning and the reform of the SS were of paramount importance for the overall development in a region. Mr. Sohlström identified two kinds of problems based upon his experience in the field

1. There is a lack of political will in the region
2. Problems of coordination within the EU and between international actors

He concluded that a triple coherence was required:

1. better coherence within the pillars
2. better coherence with international actors
3. better coherence with technical assistance and political engagement

Experience from Bosnia-Herzegovina

Martin Ney, Senior Deputy High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina, brought in the perspective and lessons learnt from Bosnia-Herzegovina. He identified progress in terms of SSR in the following areas: judicial reform, intelligence reform, defence reform and police reform. Despite this progress he demonstrated certain challenges to a successful SSR in BiH such as organised crime, corruption and border control. He expressed that further progress was dependant on political will. Therefore, the possibility of EU membership was a necessary incentive for reforms;

With other speakers he agreed on the importance of coordination in order to tackle SSR related issues. He then stated that wider security and rule of law reforms could be important benchmarks for BiH's integration towards the EU. He said what was missing in BiH was a comprehensive policy strategy based on the assessment of the state of the SS. This assessment should be undertaken by local authorities and would be supported by the EU. Its results could then determine EU activities and lead to coherent assistance and an efficient allocation of resources. This would also clarify which tasks could be undertaken by the EUSR or the EUPM or the EUFOR.



Discussion

In the following discussion, the problem of regional crime was discussed. Furthermore, the difficult question was raised how to apply lessons learnt from Bosnia to Kosovo. Additionally, it was stated that SSR was linked to the enhancement of investment. An increase in investment would positively influence any further progress of SSR. It was then stressed that the EU had the potential to positively contribute to SSR; it was however not denied that there were still certain shortcomings and the need for improvement for the work of the EU.



Panel IV - Other Important Actors in the Field of SSR

Panel IV was chaired by **Thomas Hajnozci**, Director for Security Policy at the MFA.

Susan Pond, Head of Partnership for Peace and Cooperation Programmes, Political and Security Policy Division, NATO added to the discussion the NATO perspective. Out of approximately 2000 PfP activities many contributed to SSR. She then stated that good governance in the defence sector was important. To achieve this it would be necessary to integrate civilian experts also beyond the MOD. There was an action plan on defence & security institution building (PAD-DIP) which included the following goals: civil and democratic control of armed forces, transparent budgeting, crisis management and interagency cooperation. She also stressed that it was important to turn more attention to civilians and therefore civilians should also be trained for security tasks in a country. For this reason, it would be helpful to establish a network of academies.

She mentioned that there were a few lessons learned from NATO during the last few years:

1. After the Cold War and after 9/11 it is evident that arms alone can't provide security anymore. It takes partnerships for border control and also for financing.
2. No NATO member nation is alone with its reform; all the nations have to reform.
3. A good civil society is needed (media, civil experts, NGOs...). These actors are the key to bring forward the reform programme. They help to guarantee broader participation.
4. There is a huge problem of resources in the Balkans, especially of financial resources and personnel.
5. It is important to build up an entire government; it is difficult to concentrate just on security.

Regarding local ownership, Mrs. Pond said that change could not be imposed. She then said that local ownership was also important to sustain the effort. SSR was a process and therefore local ownership was needed to continue the process.



Concerning the international community, she said that it was important to provide management tools so that the country could take over ownership.

A security concept had to be holistic. One should not limit the perspective to the ministry of defence. Other ministers had to accept the reform, too.

Coordination and information-sharing should become duties of all the actors in the region. This would primarily, help to gain transparency. Work programmes should be transparent to each other. Secondly, the division of labour tasks would help to avoid duplication. Thirdly, joint action would facilitate to work more collaboratively.

One practical recommendation for enhancing transparency and coordination of SSR activities on the field level by Ms Pond was as to establish “local clearing houses”.

Tony Welch, Co-ordinator for the Kosovo Internal Security Sector Review, UNMIK, declared that the competency of security had to be handed over to the local government. To do so it was important to look where we are, so we can see where we go. This is what the internal security review does.

He told the participants of the seminar that there was still ethnic animosity in Kosovo. The economy was very important. 90% of the minorities were unemployed. Most of the money in the region came from external sources. Living conditions and the infrastructure still needed to be improved. Welch also pleaded for a holistic approach in the region. The international community should provide a strategic direction. The focus on time was important. The international institutions had to keep in step with the capacity-building of the countries of the region. They should not get ahead of them or fall behind them. This was a matter of time balance.

Kim Traavik, Ambassador and Special Advisor, Norwegian MFA, claimed that cooperation with the countries in the region was of high importance as the international partners could only support reform programmes that were really wanted and needed. In regard of the question of local ownership, Mr. Traavik said that the authorities of the recipient countries had to have the will to push through the reforms. It was not enough if just the defence ministry accepted the reform. There had to be an interest of all the other parts of the country or rather the government.

He also agreed with Mrs. Pond in regard to international cooperation. Stronger coordination, sharing of work/responsibility/costs and prevention of duplication is needed.



Pieter Verbeek, Director of Working Table III of the Stability Pact, saw two urgent issues:

First, it is necessary to establish better coordination for the fight against organised crime, border controls and so on. These issues have a spill-over effect on the EU. Thus, there is a mutual interest.

Secondly, SSR reform is part of our own EU agenda. Knowledge and experience should be shared.

Mr. Verbeek criticised that the EU saw cooperation between south-east European countries as a prerequisite for EU accession, but provided little support to regional cooperation programmes. He further stated that the EU concentrated on capacity building (working on legislature, building institutions...) but this did not guarantee implementation. The EU had to insist on results.

In regard of local ownership Mr Verbeek claimed that there was a problem with the mentality of the people in the region. He said that there was the opinion, “When you tell us what to do and pay for it, we’ll do it.”

He noted that the SSR was moving slowly and that might lead to the accession of immature states to the EU.

His solution is to insist on more local ownership, to involve civil society, to insist on more resources from the countries and to develop regional networks.

Heinz Vetschera, Deputy Head of Mission, EUMM (Sarajewo) stated that his organisation provided a “transmission belt” for western values. He pointed out that there was no EU versus Balkan situation. The states of the Balkan were members of the OSCE so the demand of the OSCE was a demand of equal partners and binding for all. Vetschera emphasised the central function of the OSCE “Code of Conduct on Political-Military issues”. If the countries of the region recognised this, it was just a question of implementation.

He also stressed that duplication and institutional competition should be avoided. The international community should insist on and assist in implementation.



Discussion

In the discussion a delegate noted that the level of the SSR in all the Western Balkan states were not on the same level and this should be considered in the discussion. The answer from the panel was that the differences have to be and indeed are acknowledged. They do not decrease the importance of regional cooperation and the final goal of a reformed security sector in all the countries of the Western Balkans.



V. Findings - Working Groups

Working Group A:

CONCEPTUAL BASIS FOR EU SSR ACTIVITIES – ENHANCING CROSS-PILLAR COORDINATION WITHIN THE EU

MAIN POINTS

Current state of SSR related documents:

- Commission's contribution to SSR still under construction
- Final objective: establishing an overarching / holistic concept
- Challenge: how to interlink the more operational ESDP concept with the much broader EC concept?

Proposals for enhancing coordination/coherence within the EU:

- joint fact finding missions
- establishing register/database for stock-tacking of SSR-initiatives (through EUSR / Head of EC delegations; on a voluntary basis)
- establishing Task-Force (Commission: "Network of SSR expertise")

Constraints / Difficulties:

- Financing (objective is to use existing instruments)
- PSC cannot give guidance
- Terminology (DDR is component of SSR)
- Parliamentary control in ESDP is lacking
- Difficult to bring together development society and security people
- Ensuring local ownership

Proposals for strengthening coherence of SSR action towards recipient countries:

- training and education are very important
- using political dialogue as tool for enhancing SSR
- integrating SSR in country strategy papers



Focus on SSR does not mean revising the Copenhagen criteria (but providing assistance to candidate countries to advance accession)!!

Working Group B:

LESSONS LEARNED IN THE WESTERN BALKANS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

MAIN POINTS

- Despite a gradual EU engagement in SSR in the Western Balkans and the positive results that have been achieved, there are still certain problems and even “dilemmas”. For ex.: problems of coherence, ownership and conditionality;
- A Strategy for SSR is needed which should not only cover one state of SSR; furthermore the implementation of the strategy is of crucial importance;
- The strategy should be wide enough to cover all areas of the Security Sector!
- Nevertheless, within this strategy priority areas are needed! f.ex. : Police, judiciary sector ...
- SSR is a part of an overall stabilisation process which comprises political, economic and social elements.
- Recommendation for the EU: “promise less - deliver more”
- With regard to the growing influence of the EU in the Western Balkans, an atmosphere of competition with other international actors or among countries should be avoided. This also applies for the WB Balkan countries themselves.
- With regard to EU integration: a very important point has been made by emphasizing the proposals to move the perspectives towards CFSP/ESDP and to find common regional goals in that scope.
- In connection with this, ESDP education and training should be enhanced in the region.
- Some speakers emphasized the crucial role of civil society in SSR process in the WB



- The region is still burdened by lack of mutual confidence. Therefore, there is a need for focusing on confidence building
- Furthermore, all means of regional integration should be reinforced (RAVIAC...)

Working Group C:

PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION OF SSR

- SSR is not only focused on armed forces and secret services. Since it deals also with foreign affairs, interior, justice, human rights, social and also economic politics not only defence committees of parliaments are involved, but others too.
- The role of parliaments in SSR can be considered in two directions.
 - legislation in the ongoing reform process
 - control function in all phases of the process and as a permanent element beyond the formal finishing of SSR processes.
- In the overall framework parliaments as the formal “spokespersons” of civil society. The weaker civil society is the weaker parliaments are generally, but they can set benchmarks for democratic development
- Political parties function as pillars of democratic decision making. Therefore there is an eminent public interest in public funding of political parties (and party foundations for training and dissemination of information)
- Also in developed democracies the role of parliaments is changing in the direction of a more intensive participation even in areas which traditionally are dominated by governments, e.g. foreign affairs and defence.
- In the Western Balkans the political role of parliaments has to be promoted generally.

Due to the development of political culture parliaments can no longer be considered as another platform for the fight against the “enemy” (difficult only few years after the war).

Political “fights” have to take place between competitors and not enemies.



- Controlling instruments (like “Wehrbeauftragter” and “Beschwerdekommission” as instruments of the parliament) guarantee the involvement of parliaments in defence matters beyond the purely legislative function.

Institutions like “National Security Councils” can serve as a forum where governments (MFA, MOD, MOI, MOJ and heads of governments),

Parliaments and political parties are involved in crucial affairs of security policy – not limited to committees.

- In order to empower parliaments and parliamentary committees more training of MP’s and – with regard to the element continuity(!) – especially parliamentary staff is required.
- The EP, parliaments of the Member States and parliaments in the region have to improve cooperation at any level (committees and subcommittees, delegations and any others) beyond the already existing contacts at the level of presidents by using different instruments such as conferences, seminars, exchange of staff etc.

This cooperation should also be established between parliaments and governmental institutions or any other “branch of power”.



Working Group D:

CONTRIBUTION OF THE MILITARY TO SSR WITHIN THE ESDP FRAMEWORK

Preparing working group D the EU Military Staff had presented a remarkable paper concerning specific contribution of the military to SSR within the ESDP framework.

As part of the holistic EU SSR approach the military dimension encompasses training, mentoring, advising and assisting the armed forces in their transformation process .

Particularly the military can play a relevant though not exclusive role in:

- defining a defence policy, a clear delineation of tasks between armed forces and police;
- organizing defence structures, including political control (civilian and/or adequate parliamentary control), oversight/budget control, administration, transparency;
- defining military planning procedures;
- training the armed forces at all levels including in the democratic principles of modern armed forces, regarding human rights, international law, international humanitarian law etc.
- military governance issues;
- collocating experts to monitor, mentor and advise national authorities in all issues related to defence policy and SSR
- the process of equipping the armed forces, establishing a mechanism for procurement, maintenance as well as budgetary or financial regulations.

A key element in establishing EU capabilities in support of SSR activities would be the setting up of “Teams of experts”.

The Civilian-Military Cell within the EUMS could be the appropriate place to set up a database comprising experts in the various fields of SSR.



The need for collaboration between EU military roles and those of other players, in particular NATO, was highlighted. The group concurred that effective cooperation is essential.

VI. CONCLUDING PANEL

In the Concluding Panel its chairman **Theodor Winkler** remarked that the experience the EU made with SSR had also a positive impact for the EU itself. The example of border management was given.

Plamen Pantev, Director of the Institute for Security and International Studies (ISIS) in Sofia, made clear that the reform of the behaviour of security personnel and the development of a security/defence culture was an essential element of SSR in the Western Balkans. Further important tasks to be tackled are: ethnic tensions, dealing with war criminals, coping with pending legal questions etc. He further mentioned the vital role of civil society as well as the important issue of human rights.

Lucia Montanaro-Jankovski, Policy Analyst, European Policy Centre, regretted the absence of a “Gesamtkonzept” as well as emphasised the need for tailored approaches to SSR. She argued that it was necessary to harmonize the strategic long term objectives (good governance, attitude of people...) with tactical short term objectives (organised crime, corruption, unemployment...). Furthermore, she claimed that SSR was a long term endeavour requiring the improvement of training and education. She then suggested that SSR should be included in EU Commission’s Country Strategy Papers.

Judy Batt again emphasised the issue of coordination and coherence. She **Eekelen** stated that the EU had already been doing a lot of SSR activities. This has however often been undertaken under a different label. Therefore she concluded, SSR was not a new area for the EU.



In the closing remarks, **Thomas Hajnoczi**, Director for Security Policy, MFA Austria, emphasized that the EU in its efforts to improve SSR should especially focus on coordination and coherence. Any improvements in internal and external security in the Western Balkans are also linked to the establishment of democratic norms, sound principles of good governance, and the rule of law. For this aim, the perspective of EU accession remains the strongest incentive. In order to achieve this long-term goal, Mr. Hajnoczi referred to one of the conclusions reached during the seminar which called for better inter-parliamentary cooperation and exchange between European and Member States' parliaments and their counterparts in the Western Balkans. The EU should continue its combined efforts in the Western Balkans in order to perpetuate the positive momentum created so far.