

CENTRE DE POLITIQUE DE SECURITE - GENEVE
GENEVA CENTRE FOR SECURITY POLICY
GENFER ZENTRUM FÜR SICHERHEITSPOLITIK



GCSP Annual Report 2002

**Approved by the Foundation Council
11 June 2003**

| | |
|--|----------|
| Message from the Chairman of the Foundation Council | 3 |
| Message from the Director | 4 |
| Introduction | 6 |

1. Training Activities

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.1. Overview | 7 |
| 1.2. 16 th International Training Course in Security Policy (ITC)..... | 7 |
| 1.3. 6 th European Security Policy Training Course (ETC)..... | 10 |
| 1.4. 3 rd New Issues in Security Course (NISC) | 11 |
| 1.5. Training Course for Junior Swiss Diplomats | 13 |
| 1.6. Swiss Ambassadors Course | 14 |
| 1.7. Career Officers Supplementary Training Course 2 | 14 |
| 1.8. Arms Control and Regulation Training Seminar..... | 15 |
| 1.9. Moscow Seminar | 15 |
| 1.10. Simulation Exercises | 16 |
| 1.11. Language Training | 16 |

2. Research, seminar and platform activities

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.1. Research activities | 17 |
| 2.2. Cluster of Competence (Islam, Islamic Groupings, and the West) | 18 |
| 2.3. Austrian and Swiss Security Policy Workshop | 18 |
| 2.4. The EU and its Neighbourhood | 19 |
| 2.5. Peace Operations after 11 September 2001 | 20 |
| 2.6. GCSP-RAND Workshop (Asymmetric Threats) | 20 |
| 2.7. GCSP-Yale Workshop (Transatlantic Relations after 11 September 2001)..... | 21 |
| 2.8. Multicultural Problem Solving | 21 |
| 2.9. Brown Bag Lunch on Arms Control | 22 |
| 2.10. 5 th International Security Forum..... | 22 |
| 2.11. Publications..... | 23 |
| 2.12. Platform and Conference Activities..... | 23 |
| 2.13. Frozen Conflict Series | 24 |

3. Networking and Outreach

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.1. PfP Training Centre | 24 |
| 3.2. PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes..... | 25 |
| 3.3. Inter-University Committee on Security Studies in Bosnia and Herzegovina (CSS) | 27 |
| 3.4. OSCE Academy, Bishkek..... | 28 |
| 3.5. University of Marne-la-Vallée..... | 28 |
| 3.6. Alumni activities..... | 28 |
| 3.7. Cyber News | 30 |
| 3.8. E-learning, Prep-Kit..... | 31 |

4. Organisation

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|----|
| 4.1. | Personnel..... | 31 |
| 4.2. | The Foundation Council | 33 |
| 4.3. | Visiting Scholars and Interns | 35 |
| 4.4. | Infrastructure..... | 36 |

5. Accounts

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------|----|
| 5.1. | Income and Expenditures | 36 |
|------|-------------------------------|----|

Annexes can be found at: (http://www.gcsp.ch/Website/GCSP/e/publications/Other-pubs/AR-2002_annexes.pdf)

- Annex 1: International Training Course in Security Policy (16th ITC)
- Annex 2: European Training Course in Security Policy (6th ETC)
- Annex 3: New Issue in Security Course (3rd NISC)
- Annex 4: Training Courses for Junior Swiss Diplomats
- Annex 5: Swiss Ambassadors Course
- Annex 6: Career Officers Supplementary Training Course 2
- Annex 7: Arms Control and Regulation Training Seminar
- Annex 8: Moscow Seminar
- Annex 9: Cluster of Competence (Islam, Islamic Groupings, and the West)
- Annex 10: Austrian and Swiss Security Policy Workshop
- Annex 11: The EU and its Neighbourhood
- Annex 12: Peace Operations after 11 September 2001
- Annex 13: GCSP-RAND Workshop (Asymmetric Threats)
- Annex 14: GCSP-Yale Workshop (Transatlantic Relations after 11 September 2001)
- Annex 15: Platform activities, Conferences and Workshops
- Annex 16: GCSP Faculty CVs

Message from the Chairman of the Foundation Council

2002 has been a year of major change at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy as a result of which the GCSP is now placed at a crossroads in terms of its future orientation.

In December 2002, the Centre broadened its Foundation Council to seven new members: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Spain and the then Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (now Serbia and Montenegro). This Big Bang, which parallels similar transformations occurring in the autumn of 2002 within the European Union and the Atlantic Alliance, brings the GCSP to a situation in which most of the countries of the Euro-Atlantic area are now represented on the Council. Although significant exceptions still exist, including, *inter alia*, Canada, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the GCSP is now facing the issue of the future limits of its enlargement. Therefore, the GCSP Foundation Council decided, at its December 2002 meeting, to review in 2003 the criteria for future membership application. In particular, the question of whether and, as the case may be, how to extend beyond its Euro-Atlantic membership will be discussed.

2002 also witnessed the designation of Ambassador Gérard Stoudmann as the Centre's new Director. His predecessor, Ambassador Ulrich Lehner, had done a fantastic job in his four years tenure in making the GCSP an internationally recognized centre of excellence in its core competences. Having inherited a delicate situation in 1998, he not only set the GCSP on an even keel, but he made it into the high-performance, and happy ship that it is today. His personal and professional qualities were universally appreciated, and made his departure a sad occasion: we wish him every success in his new appointment as head of the Swiss Foreign Ministry's Policy Planning Staff. Ambassador Gérard Stoudmann brings to the Centre an extraordinary wealth of professional

experience, most recently as the head of the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights in Warsaw which he helped to develop into a substantial and effective organization during his tenure. His network of relations in the Euro-Atlantic area along with his competence and an impressive energy level provide the Centre with the kind of leadership required at a time of new initiatives committing our future.

Indeed, as this report makes abundantly clear, the changing international security situation, with the emergence of hyperterrorism and major strategic change in the greater Middle-East, makes it mandatory for the Centre to tailor its activities accordingly. This is occurring at a time when post-Cold War initiatives - notably the Partnership for Peace - are being superseded to some extent by the enlargement process of the Atlantic Alliance and the establishment of new NATO-Russia relations and institutions. Furthermore, shrinking force structures in Europe, as a result of the shift from manpower-heavy conscript forces to smaller professional armies combined with the large number of military commitments, from peacekeeping to force projection, put pressure on the participation of defence officials in the sorts of activities provided by the GCSP. The Centre has met these challenges with success in 2002 as in previous years, but the need to adapt further will increase, not decrease, in the near future.

Thus, the GCSP is possibly at its most important crossroads since its creation in the mid-Nineties. The Foundation Council and the Director of the Centre, along with its highly professional staff, have a solid base from which to consider and implement the corresponding decisions.

François Heisbourg

Message from the Director

When I joined the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP) last November, I inherited an institution which had carved for itself, over the years, a reputation of excellence in post-graduate, professional education, offering some exclusive features in the field of comprehensive security training. Indeed, not many institutions offer to a multinational, cross-cultural mix of mid-career civil servants, a setting and an environment, including twelve highly qualified teaching faculty members, specialized in security matters, as the GCSP does in Geneva.

Together with the GCSP, I am indebted to the former Director, Ambassador Ulrich Lehner, and to the faculty, in particular the course directors, for having achieved this. High quality training will remain the *raison d'être* as well as the challenge for the coming years.

However, continuity does not mean immobility, and the GCSP must address a rapidly changing security and strategic environment, if it will remain competitive. We must not only be aware of the changing environment, but we must also anticipate changes “over the horizon” in order to offer the best possible products. Indeed, “9/11” and Iraq are just two illustrations and highlights of tectonic changes taking place and which will make the world look different in many respects over the next ten years. As we are facing more questions than we can answer, institutions such as the GCSP will have to address new issues with creativity, imagination and flexibility.

Among the qualities needed to overcome successfully the challenges ahead, an improved perception of the thinking of others – how and why others may perceive situations differently? – and an improved sensitivity for early indicators of changes, particularly critical in the context of asymmetrical threats, are of utmost importance. The GCSP, through its

training, already contributes substantially to the development of these qualities.

The offer in terms of courses, curricula and course participants will be adapted where and when appropriate. For instance, starting with the next academic year, all courses will be open to participants from the Mediterranean and the Middle East as European Security is increasingly linked to developments beyond its geographic area. Later, based on experience, the opportunity of enlarging the scope of participants will have to be assessed. Developments such as these will reflect the globalization of security concerns, but not at the cost of quality nor at the cost of departing from our present strengths and comparative advantages which clearly lie within the Eurasian region. Evidently, a delicate balance must be found.

Similarly, the so-called “soft-issues” linked to human security and good governance, such as organized crime, corruption, migration, including human trafficking, etc., are continuing to gain in importance as they contribute to the development of an unpredictable environment, to leadership and State failure and therefore to the asymmetrical nature of threats. Such issues will increasingly influence the curriculum of the GCSP because they influence our common security.

We must confront and are indeed facing other challenges as well:

- to improve GCSP’s exposure – including enhancements to our website and media presence, and better networking with the Geneva international community;
- to develop GCSP’s network and cooperation with other institutions active in the field of security policy, identifying whenever possible joint projects. This is already well underway, particularly with such partners as the Centre for the

Democratic Control of Armed Forces in Geneva (DCAF), the US Institute of Peace (USIP) or the Centre For Strategic & International Studies (CSIS) in Washington;

- to develop the availability of GCSP expertise to its members. This can take different forms, from briefings for the benefit of relevant commissions of the Swiss Parliament to special training courses in member countries, such as the one organized next September in Belgrade for young professionals from the ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defence and Interior of Serbia and Montenegro.
- to enhance the Foundation Council's ownership role in the work of the Centre, also in view of diversifying its funding sources.

These examples are in no way exhaustive, but whatever developments we might consider in the future, they will have to be "demand driven". Every new activity initiated this year corresponds both to a need and a demand from our partners, interlocutors, and member States.

To address future challenges, our team has already been and will continue to be expanded within modest limits; Dr. Julian Lindley-French (EU Institute for Security Studies) has joined the Faculty in January 2003 and Dr. Anne Deighton (Oxford University) will join

us as well in September. Mr. Hrair Balian (formerly OSCE and ICG) as Director of "special programmes" will be responsible for coordinating non-teaching activities (i.e., platforms and other similar activities).

The fact that such experienced and skilled professionals have accepted to work with us speaks for the GCSP reputation and I am convinced that the Centre will greatly benefit from their refreshing presence. In the coming months, we will also endeavour to recruit three additional faculty members (from Russia, the US, as well as a specialist of security challenges beyond the Euro-Atlantic space), thus further enhancing our teaching capabilities and expertise.

This is only a beginning – at least I hope – of a continuous adaptation process to a changing security environment. This would not have been possible without the strong support from the main contributor to the Foundation, the Swiss Government, as well as the support of the Foundation Council, in particular its President, François Heisbourg, for which I am most grateful.

Gérard Stoudmann

Introduction

During 2002, the GCSP continued with its core activities: training, research and networking, detailed exhaustively in this report.

- Three principal training courses – International Training Course (ITC), European Training Course (ETC), and New Issues in Security Course (NISC) – were offered to mid-career participants from Euro-Atlantic Partnership Countries (EAPC).
- Research, seminars and platform activities remained essential complementary elements for maintaining the high standards of GCSP training courses. Such activities included among others workshops on the “Islamic Movements and the West”, “Peace Operations in Light of the Events of September 11th, 2001”, a commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the CSCE/OSCE process, the Yale Seminar, and a high-level conference on the Nagorno-Karabakh peace process. Most of these activities were implemented in cooperation with other institutions.
- The GCSP networking efforts were redoubled during 2002 with the initiation of a number of cooperative activities, including the signing of a memorandum of understanding with the Democratic Control of Armed Forces in Geneva (DCAF) and the initiation of joint activities with institutions in transition countries.

The past year also saw the GCSP expand its Foundation Council to 28 members by welcoming seven new countries: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Spain and Serbia and Montenegro. The December 2002 GCSP Foundation Council meeting took note of these ongoing activities and endorsed Director Gerard Stoudmann’s concept for the future of the Centre. Ambassador Stoudmann emphasized that his concept proposed an “evolution, not a revolution” for GCSP and did not involve

a departure from its core training mandate. However he pointed out, the GCSP must adapt to an increasingly competitive environment in its core field of competence. The Director outlined his new concept for the future of GCSP in the following points:

- Expand the geographical scope of GCSP course participants beyond the Euro-Atlantic region to include the Middle East, the Mediterranean, and possibly East Asia, without compromising standards.
- Focus on emerging issues, including the new security environment.
- Provide executive-level and out of Geneva courses, and review the possibility of further expanding the course offer.
- Pursue the accreditation of courses offered.
- Enhance substantive cooperation with other institutions in the security field.
- Produce more policy-driven publications.
- Raise the GCSP profile through more effective links with the alumni network, the Geneva international community, and provide expertise for the benefit of Swiss authorities, in particular the Parliament.
- Expand platform activities through the Frozen Conflict Series and the Geneva Series for Security Policy, thus also providing alternative venues for discussion among actors.
- Invite additional faculty and staff to meet the challenges of the new concept.
- Establish an Advisory Board of prominent personalities to guide the GCSP on key policy issues.

To conclude, the Director underscored that the feasibility of these new approaches and activities will be strictly demand-driven.

1. Training Activities

1.1. Overview

During the year 2002, the GCSP continued with its core objectives to promote peace, stability, and security through training activities in international security policy, with a specific focus on the European and transatlantic region. Thus, training activities were organised for diplomats, military officers and civil servants from foreign, defense and other relevant ministries of Partnership for Peace and NATO countries. However, the “acceleration de l’histoire” poses a great challenge to the GCSP curricula and their international competitiveness. The response to this challenge is a continuous effort and is fought on several fronts.

First, the course curricula are becoming more flexible, regardless of the length of the course. The International Training Course (ITC) has added new electives to the course: in the module on the Mediterranean, for example, the participants have now the opportunity to opt for an in-depth approach either on North Africa or on Turkey. The European Training Course (ETC) added a special “vertical” module on terrorism and the New Issues in Security Course (NISC) created a weekly module on international terrorism.

Second, the quality of the course. The quality of a course can only be maintained if the trainer/participant ratio is low. For that purpose the GCSP hired in 2002 two new faculty members who will represent an important reinforcement of the resident faculty. Furthermore, the course quality is also a function of the quality of the course participants. In this respect, the GCSP together with the help of several Swiss embassies, managed to implement a coherent language test scheme for scholarship countries.

Third, in 2002, the GCSP entered an accreditation agreement with the Université de Marne-la-Vallée and the pilot phase started with the 2002/2003 academic year. Other accreditations

and course equivalencies will have to be pursued in order to maintain the competitiveness of the courses.

Fourth, the GCSP adds shorter courses to its list of activities. In the summer 2002, the GCSP organised and ran for the first time a four-day course for Swiss Ambassadors on select topics of global and European security.

Fifth, the courses must be policy relevant and the course participants should be exposed to policymaking at governmental and institutional levels as well as on the level of field missions. This principle very much reflects the GCSP Director’s Concept for GCSP Future Action. A first event of such an interface between training and a track-II type of meeting took place in the ITC week on peace building, where the Minsk Group and the Chief Negotiators of Armenia and Azerbaijan were integrated into an ITC panel on the topic of the Frozen Conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh. The dimension of field missions was also introduced in 2002 in the form of a Mission Planning exercise for peace operations (Purple Nile).

Finally, efforts continued in e-learning in view of strengthening course support. An educational module on NATO has been prepared by three faculty members. The module was run during the period leading up to the NATO Summit in Prague. The class included twelve Alumni coming from various institutions, such as Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Foreign Affairs or international organizations covering NATO-member and new member states as well as candidates for NATO membership.

1.2. *16th International Training Course in Security Policy (ITC 2001-2002)*

The 16th International Training Course (ITC) was held between 10 October 2001 and 20 June 2002 at the GCSP. The number of participants was 26 from 22 countries (Annex 1). Twenty-five participants have concluded their studies; (one of the two Russian participants was withdrawn from the course by his national authorities due to his private problems after

Term 2). This meant that the class was significantly smaller than the previous two ITCs. It was due to the fact some of those countries, which regularly sent participants to the course, have either suspended their participation (Finland) or reduced the number of their participants from two to one (Germany, Sweden, Switzerland). It is not entirely clear what this change could be attributed to. It could be due to budgetary reasons, reorganisation (downsizing) of armed forces and to increasing international commitments. For the first time in ITC history participants have attended the course from Armenia and Yugoslavia. The geographical imbalance that characterised some of the earlier ITCs remained. There were no participants attending from Greece, Portugal, Spain or Turkey. Fifteen participants from countries of Eastern and East-Central Europe and Central Asia received scholarships from Switzerland. It is necessary to pay attention that scholarship holders would not significantly outnumber those whose stay in Geneva is financed by their governments. The ratio of scholarship holders to non-scholarship holders was 15 to 11.

The composition of the faculty responsible for the ITC changed compared to the 15th ITC. The course director as well as those responsible for the first and the third terms remained the same (Pál Dunay, Jan Hyllander and Shahram Chubin, respectively), whereas the newly joined faculty member, Andrei Zagorski, took responsibility for co-running term two. His experience as guest speaker at the course helped his easy and fast integration.

Achievements and Problems Both the organisational efforts and the curriculum were well received by the participants. The course was run smoothly by the faculty and staff of the GCSP. The structure of the course is established and the most important elements of the schedule are recognised. Contrary to two previous years, and in light of the changes carried out in the programme, there were no critical comments concerning the “monotony” of the course structure. In spite of the balance established between top down and participant active elements of the programme, more attention should

still be given to further development of the practical character of the course. This is necessary, among others, due to the fact that an increasing number of participants are arriving to the ITC after full, high quality university studies. Hence providing a supplementary training in order to reduce the shortcomings of the previous studies is gradually losing its relevance.

The 16th ITC was the first where the completion of the transition process in several East-central European countries was noticeable. Contrary to the previous courses where there was an at least tacit transfer of knowledge from West to East this was not the case. Many participants from East-central Europe were fully competitive with participants from western countries as far as level of competence, activity and language ability. It was an indirect consequence of this fact that an English course had to be offered to two participants only.

The curriculum is generally accepted and requires adaptation only in light of the evolution of the international security agenda. The guest speaker programme of the ITC is much appreciated. In light of the 11 September 2001 events and their aftermath some adaptation was already carried out (e.g. increasing the time devoted to terrorism at the expense of time spent on trans-national organised crime). It was obvious that there was no need to revise the programme fundamentally forthwith, as many guest speakers were expected to reflect upon those recent changes anyway. This is not applicable for the 17th and subsequent ITCs, however. Hence certain adaptation of the course will be necessary due to the changing needs of a comprehensive course on international security.

The course will have to reflect the lasting change of the international security posture more than during the 16th ITC. This was just as recognised by the faculty as requested by the participants. One critical participant in his response to the end of course questionnaire assessed the course curriculum as follows: “It is a course designed clearly before 9/11 and probably just after the fall of the Berlin wall.” It is clear that the forthcoming adaptation should

increase the time devoted to new and emerging issues of international security without damaging the analytical presentation of the security problems in the Euro-Atlantic area. This may result in a situation that the presentation of the latter will have to be consolidated and the time devoted to the “new” issues increased. It carries the danger, however, of breaking up the traditional division among the three terms (Term 1: Conceptual issues, Term 2: The Euro-Atlantic area, Term 3: New and emerging issues). There is no doubt for instance that transnational organised crime has to be re-introduced in the programme and a couple of other matters will have to gain more prominence (cyber war, nationalism, the role of religion, corruption and governance were mentioned specifically in this context) than earlier.

There is also the dilemma of how the ITC can combine the comprehensive character of the course with a sufficiently rich offer of elective elements. The elective offering has become richer for the 16th ITC, it may require further adaptation for the 17th ITC, however.

The ITC faces certain dilemmas as far as the structure of the course and there is certainly room for improvement. Although the 16th ITC was overwhelmingly satisfied with the weekly schedule, our report will focus upon areas of improvement. The *concluding seminar* was most critically assessed in this respect, an issue the faculty has been struggling with for some years. It is clear that participants rightly expect a conceptual conclusion from the faculty preferably with the active involvement of the class. This has not been the case every time. The dissatisfaction with some concluding seminars has dominated the opinion about this part of the schedule.

In the case of *group seminars*, the necessary improvement should stem from more systematic preparation and consultation as well as more systematic feedback to those who contribute to the seminar with presentations. Preparation should improve so as to identify well in advance those topics which are not covered by other elements of the programme and hence

group seminars are expected to cover. The faculty should put together a list of such topics for each term. The participants responsible for the group seminar should be consulted and the faculty, primarily in the first term, should take a proactive stance on consultations. Following the group seminars more attention should be paid to debrief those participants who ran them.

The participants would be willing to take advantage of the knowledge of the faculty more often. It is certain that more time should be spent on professional interaction with the participants. As the size of the faculty increases and its competence broadens it may be advisable to take advantage of this competence in forms that have not been explored, e.g. at voluntary “research” seminars. The individual consultation time should also increase in the case of some faculty members. As far as *core seminar papers* and *core seminar presentations* are concerned it is common sense that the writing of a major analytical paper may be a valuable contribution to the improvement of participants’ capabilities. There is agreement on this between participants and the faculty. Consequently it is the question how to maximise the benefits from this part of the programme. In order that the participants and the faculty could interact sufficiently on the topic of the core paper it is necessary to clearly set out the phases of preparation and establish deadlines for the necessary series of consultations. The faculty, here again, has to take a proactive stance and must be able to guide the participant through the process. This has to extend to a clear briefing to the participant, including a professional critique of the paper. As the participants devote significant time and energy to their core paper and the evaluation of the papers also have an important part in the assessment letter, it is necessary to introduce some additional formal guarantee of objective assessment. The faculty member assessing the paper should not be the same person as the tutor. With these adaptations and setting certain standards for advice, consultation and assessment, the core seminar papers and their presentations can become an even more useful part of the programme.

The *exercise and skill improvement programme*, due to the combination of different reasons, was somewhat more critically assessed than in the previous years. The exercises of term one (Ice breaker and communication exercise, negotiation exercise, “Purple Nile” exercise) belong to the successful elements of the programme. The “Geneva Games”, the only major exercise in term 2 was more critically assessed by the participants than before. The exercise partly requires some technical consolidation (better use of available time, smaller syndicates, etc.), and partly some more consideration should be given to the scenario. The Media Exercise, executed in the current form for the first time, should be reorganised so that it would give more opportunity to the participants to practise the necessary skills rather than a “top down” transfer of knowledge.

The 16th ITC was professionally demanding. The regular short trips (visit of a military facility in Term one, Bern excursion in Term two, Thun and Spiez visit, Alumni trip in Term three) were complemented by a longer trip to Paris and Brussels. The one week long field trip was extremely useful and well received by the participants. With better preparation it is necessary to guarantee that the participants could also gain experience in the headquarters of major international institutions in Brussels.

The great majority of ITC participants took French classes during their stay in Geneva. Some spouses joined them. Upon public demand some participants requested extra classes. The extra classes have resulted in some problems, however, as the gap between the level of knowledge of those who took double classes and other participants widened. It seems that many participants would support the idea to have French classes at least twice a week. The feasibility of the idea, including its financial implications, has to be explored.

The “Best Core Seminar Paper” and the “Best Participant” Awards were issued at the end of the 16th ITC. There is no doubt that the former one is a useful incentive for many. It is more doubtful whether it can be decided who the best

participant is. Hence, it will have to be reconsidered whether there is reason to issue the best participant award again.

1.3. *6th European Security Policy Training Course (ETC 2002)*

Course Objectives A key ETC objective is to establish and maintain a close link with current developments and evolving policy situations, mainly in Europe. The curriculum is revised each year and adapted to the latest international developments. High-ranking diplomats, military officers, and other government officials, as well as other distinguished experts from a wide range of countries are regularly invited to give guest seminars, which add an indispensable dimension to the training.

Particular care is given to familiarize participants with modern working methods (including computer and Internet training), negotiating tactics as well as drafting and briefing skills. Seminars on special topics and Crisis Management exercises are conducted throughout the course.

Background The ETC is designed to train professionals who will serve in the broad area of security policy and who will have to interact with all international agencies involved in security-related political and military decision making. It will be particularly useful to persons whose recent assignments have not been related to these areas and who, therefore, require improved and updated knowledge for their future responsibilities.

The course provides an in-depth overview of European security issues, its transatlantic links and prospects for the 21st century. The curriculum includes security concepts, the main actors (states and institutions) as well as related global challenges. Also, there are special seminars held on important issues, one of which is aiming specifically at participants who are earmarked as future Defence Attachés.

Approach/Results The 6th ETC took place from 3 January to 27 March 2002 and involved 27 participants from 25 different countries. This year the sending nations made a very thorough choice of their representatives and perfectly met the profile requirements as were defined in our letters of invitation. The professional background of the participants, without exception and regardless of their age and the length of their professional assignment, is constantly improving. All of them held a university or national military academy diploma. Even half of the participants have achieved either an M.A. or B.A. Also the number of those who have field operations and combat experience is steadily growing. Good or perfect control of the English language and computer knowledge have become a matter of routine. Different intellectual levels of participants coming from “Western” or “Eastern” countries cannot be identified any more. Seven participating ladies have proved that they push more frequently into key national positions.

The course curriculum and the instruction process had to be once again kept up to date with world affairs, providing substance and being attractive in teaching and coaching with only twelve weeks available. The approach is based on the vital and constructive feedback of former participants. The assessment of the 2002 attendants immediately after the completion of the course proved that we have found again a fine balance between frontal instruction, participants active contributions, and training. The new type of course attendants is challenging us more frequently on the provision of practicable solutions, bridging the vital gap between theory and practice. Convincing answers have substantially attracted the participants’ attention combined with the request that the speakers were personalizing themselves with their findings. These criteria will also guide us to the preparation of the new course.

The new challenge of international terrorism was covered by a sidetrack throughout the course. Several competent guest speakers gave inputs and the participants formed teams to look deeper into specific aspects of terrorism. The

summary of their findings formed an interesting picture from which we all benefited. Nevertheless, we feel that we have not overemphasized the subject, taking into account that the world goes on in other international security policy related subjects as well.

The media week was again a sound success. The coaching in personal communication, radio and television interviews, written statements and press releases by experienced external professionals gave us again a better understanding of our own personal capabilities in this vital field, an improved self-confidence in acting and another example of the high value of practical training and even drill.

In addition, for the first time, we have provided on our website a huge amount of relevant information (“The Preparation Kit”) in advance of and about the course. All participants have expressed their satisfaction on this opportunity to benefit from it to the advantage of their own enhanced preparation.

1.4. 3rd New Issues in Security Course (NISC 2002)

The third NISC course took place from 17 April to 26 June, 2002. There were originally 23 participants but two withdrew before the course began and two left the course in its early stages for personal reasons; hence, 19 participants from 18 different countries completed the course (see Annex 3). The course benefited from the experience of NISC 1 and 2 and the effective and sustained contribution of the first NISC Director, Dr. Roland Dannreuther, should be acknowledged. The NISC syllabus remains dynamic with its focus centred upon non-traditional and emerging security issues. Its outreach to participants from Ministries of Interior, in addition to the GCSP’s traditional constituencies of Defence and Foreign Ministries, is complemented by the extension of invitations to NATO-Mediterranean Dialogue countries as well as NATO partners.

Participation The course attracted a good blend of countries and participant functional responsibilities, however, the response from Western capitals was a little disappointing once again, leading to a slight imbalance of the course overall. The inclusion for the first time of a Jordanian participant added real value to the course, not least because of the events of 11 September and also the exacerbation of the dispute between Israel and the Palestinians in the Occupied Territories. Likewise, the participation of the Turkish MFA participant contributed valuable perspectives across a range of issues considered by the course. NISC 3 also saw the first North American participation with the arrival of an extremely competent Canadian Lt. Colonel with substantial peacekeeping experience.

The reading seminar was divided into 2 groups, otherwise, participants were taught as one group. The relatively small number contributed to the open discussion and the generally relaxed and cohesive dynamic of the 3rd NISC group. The deficit in western participation (3 out of 19) continued to be a problem. On the other hand, the host country provided two participants for the first time. The Swiss participants made a sustained effort to welcome their colleagues and their role was an invaluable and deeply appreciated aspect of NISC 3.

Content of the Course There were few changes to the basic curriculum (Annex 3), with the exception that a Peace Operation exercise Purple Nile replaced INTACT (an earlier version of a peace support exercise) and Africa replaced Latin America as a regional module. We accepted the recommendation of the NISC 2 report and restructured the topic concluding seminar to avoid simple repetition, focusing instead on what basic lessons had been learned, how they related to other aspects of the course, and what issues remained unresolved. In addition, we introduced mini-exercises to break up the top-down aspect and encourage a more active participation. These were judged to be extremely useful and enjoyable.

There were about 45 guest speakers who invariably performed to a high standard and were highly appreciated by the course. Two sections of the course (terrorism, and environment, demography and resources) were shared with the ITC, an arrangement that worked well and will be continued.

The participants retained responsibility for organising and leading the 'group of the week seminar' and the 'new issues of the week seminar'. These activities were generally well-regarded although their quality, as with NISC 2, remained variable. We did ask a member of the group of the week to introduce and thank guest speakers. This worked well and was appreciated by both participants and speakers.

Exercises There were four exercises during the course; the icebreaking and communication exercise, the Position Paper, Purple Nile, and the Policy Decision Brief. This was one less than the previous year, since we dropped the media exercise for scheduling reasons. Opinion on the exercises varied. Purple Nile (a simulation of planning for a peacekeeping operation) was highly appreciated by Ministry of Defence personnel and less so by MFA participants, many of whom felt that it was too "military" and who felt insufficiently prepared to cover these unfamiliar issues. On the other hand, MFA personnel liked the position paper and policy decision brief exercises, while some MoD personnel felt inadequately prepared. Although, given the nature of these exercises, these results are unsurprising, it makes sense to review the materials with which and methods by which participants are prepared for the exercises. Some participants expressed interest in the possibility of writing a short research paper.

Visits NISC went on one trip to The Hague, including visits to the ICJ, Europol, the ICTFY, and the OPCW. The trip again proved to be a great success. The one aspect that received mixed reviews was the visit to the ICJ, which many participants felt lacked substance. It is desirable, if this event is repeated, to be very clear with the ICJ regarding our expectations. The Europol visit was very good, although too

much material was covered, leaving very little time for conversation. In this instance, it is recommended that we pick one or two issues of particular importance (e.g. drugs and terrorism) and ask Europol to focus on them alone. Participants also felt that the trip should be extended two nights away rather than one.

Alumni The NISC held its second Alumni meeting in Geneva. Twelve participants from earlier courses attended. It was originally intended to hold the meeting in Morocco. However, owing to logistical ambiguities, this could not proceed. The late date at which a final decision regarding location was made created difficulties in planning the session. None the less, the meeting was generally appreciated by both alumni and participants. The social programme in particular was well regarded. GCSP staff arranged a very interesting excursion to the Swiss National Exposition. Participants and alumni felt that the meeting was very useful in strengthening the NISC network.

Summary In terms of the substance of the course, the range of topics was generally considered to be both interesting and relevant. All the weekly topics were rated highly. As noted above, the only significant change in topic was the addition of Africa and the deletion of Latin America. The tension between the regional topics and the more general topics mentioned in previous reports does not seem to have recurred. Once again, some participants felt that institutions, and particularly European institutions, received insufficient coverage. However, it is difficult to see how this problem can be fully addressed given the comparatively short duration of the course. There is already concern amongst some participants that some modules (e.g. transnational organised crime) are too short, while teaching staff felt that a number of the regional modules were too compressed. As a means of addressing some of these concerns, it has been decided, from NISC 4, that the course be extended by one week.

1.5. Training Course for Junior Swiss Diplomats

As in previous years, the GCSP was tasked by the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (DFAE) to run a two-week training course on international and Swiss security policies for Junior Swiss Diplomats.

Under the tutoring of Mr. David Law, the course was held from 24 June to 5 July. It covered global and regional security issues, European security, arms control and disarmament, humanitarian aspects of security as well as Swiss specific issues. Thirteen trainees attended the course (see Annex 4).

Following suggestions made by the previous year's participants, the 2002 programme non-lecture modules were increased to approximately 25% of the time available during the first seven days of the course. In addition, the scenario-planning exercise, which in previous years was organized in several modules distributed over the two weeks of the course, was concentrated into three sessions during the last three days. This brought the interactive element to roughly one-third of the entire programme.

In general, the speakers were thought to have been very effective and from interesting backgrounds. Participants expressed the view that the best presentations were those that directed questions to the group during the briefing as opposed to just taking their questions afterwards.

1.6. Swiss Ambassadors Course

Course Objectives The Course was designed as an introduction to global and regional security aspects. Its purpose was to allow head of Swiss missions to immerse themselves into a number of subject areas that are of particular relevance for Swiss foreign and security policy, but that were not dealt with during the annual Conference of Ambassadors.

Background The GCSP was mandated by the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs to conduct a seminar on Security Policy for Swiss Ambassadors from 26-29 August 2002.

The course gave an insight into the current security policy related developments and concepts. It intended to outline the links between classic security concepts and new transnational, non-military and global challenges to security policy in relation to the consequences on a coherent national security policy. The seminar was divided into four modules: 1) Global challenges, 2) European security, 3) Human Security, 4) Swiss Security issues.

Approach / Results The course was attended by 12 Ambassadors and 4 Defence Attachés. A strength of the course has been the marriage between conceptual and policy-oriented presentations of security-related topics, especially in the fields of globalisation, human security and governance. In terms of methodology, the course relied to a large extent on top-down presentations, panels and discussions. The faculty was made up of the GCSP faculty and a number of select experts from abroad and representatives from the Swiss administration. The size and rotation of the group did not allow creating syndicates with small group for discussions and work, as was originally planned. The absence of certain participants during certain sessions could lead to the questions whether the course was not too long for a target group such as Ambassadors.

There was an uneven distribution of knowledge of the participants as the broad field of international security was concerned. This was to be expected and it did not disturb the course proceedings too much. The participants were particularly interested in issues that were close to Swiss security, but that were of a complex nature, such as the vulnerability of the Swiss financial sector or anti-terrorist co-operation in the Schengen and third pillar confines.

1.7. *Career Officers Supplement Training Course 2*

Project Objectives The GCSP module (Transatlantic Security) is designed to form the last institutionalised capstone of the professional career officers' training in international security policy. It should contribute to a better and more comprehensive understanding of related Swiss national security concerns, which will be covered through the major (Swiss) portion of the complete 8 weeks' course, and correspond with the overall national security policy oriented objectives of the new Swiss Armed Forces structure "Army XXI".

Background The new course contains a block of 8 weeks in total, being planned, structured and organized by the Swiss Military Academy. The trainees are earmarked for assignments as commandants of Swiss Military schools and courses. They are also earmarked to be active at the highest national military education centres, or serve as defence attachés or as section chiefs at the Ministry of Defence, the General Staff, the Land Forces or the Air Force. The GCSP module can also complement the preparation for international assignments outside of Switzerland. The course is exclusively reserved for Swiss officers and consists of maximum 20 participants.

Approach The GCSP portion is held at the Centre in Geneva and takes place in week 2 of the overall course schedule. Most of the lectures and the related discussion periods are given in English. The contents of the week's schedule include a general introduction into International Security Policy, which involve participants in an interactive approach and cover five "Blocks" of the training.

- Definition of Terms (Strategy and Security as lead-in of week 1 of the course)
- The Extended Term of Security and Global Challenges
- Major Players on both Sides of the Atlantic
- Institutions Involved in Atlantic Security

- Regional Conflict Areas

Vital issues like Arms Control, Terrorism, Crisis Management, Conflict Prevention and Conflict Management are incorporated into these blocks where applicable.

The GCSP training week is complemented by a study trip to NATO and EU Headquarters and includes a final discussion at the end of the course.

1.8. Arms Control and Regulation Training Seminar

This course has now been given four times and has established a certain momentum both in terms of the number of participants (and graduates, who number nearly 80) and in terms of the teaching, curricula and staff. The 2002 course, held from 24 February to 2 March, was also the largest, comprising twenty-two participants from eleven Middle Eastern countries spread out equally between the Maghreb, the Levant and the Persian Gulf.

The origin of the course stems from a joint Swiss-Finnish initiative made in the context of the Arms Control and Regional Security talks, part of the peace process after the Madrid Conference. These ACRS talks have faltered since 1995 making the initiative even more important in an era when discussions have virtually broken down.

The course has adhered to certain principals from the outset: it would focus on arms control as an instrument of national security without focusing primarily on the Middle East context; it would seek as wide a political representation as feasible (hence Iran and Syria); it would encourage dispassionate discussion (hence the decision this year to bring an Israeli lecturer from the Jaffee Centre for Strategic Studies); and it would involve, as much as possible, institutions in Geneva, such as UNIDIR, HEL, the ICRC, and the Spiez Laboratory, as well as foreign experts from the Committee on

Disarmament, those overseas in Vienna and New York (International Peace Academy); finally, it would use where feasible in-house resources of the GCSP, faculty, administration, etc.

Over the years, we have built up a number of alumni but have yet to translate this into an alumni programme where they could be reunited from time to time. From the suggestion of participants over the years, this would be welcomed. Also, from their comments and feedback, it would appear that the course is a success, as most of their suggestions focus on lengthening the course, adding to the participants and increasing the topics covered.

This is a worthwhile course and a continuing source of prestige for Switzerland and, in light of current conditions in the region, even more timely and relevant, and hence merits continuation.

1.9. Moscow Seminar

The fourth Moscow Seminar was held on 3-4 October, 2002. It was, for the 2nd consecutive year, organized and sponsored jointly by the GCSP and the Diplomatic Academy in Moscow. The seminar consisted of two parts, a training session and a round-table.

The Training Session with students from the Diplomatic Academy addressed issues like combating international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, peace support operations and the possibility within them of Russia, NATO and EU cooperation. Active participation from the students represented was encouraged and produced productive debates. The second day was reserved for a round-table exchange between scholars of the two organizations. The participants continued discussion on issues which had been brought up the first day, but also discussed more profoundly the possibilities, as well as the hindrances, of cooperation in peace support operations.

There has been a report written summarizing the proceedings of this workshop which is currently in the stage of revision and will be published in 2003.

1.10. Simulation Exercises

Skill improvement exercises and gaming form an integral part of the GCSP training programme. An important aim is to simulate situations close to reality. The following have been conducted as part of the ITC, ETC and NISC courses.

In the *Communication Exercise*, ITC and NISC participants were provided with guidelines and developed skills in organising and communicating ideas orally in front of an audience.

The *Negotiation Exercise* improved the ITC and ETC participants' skills as negotiators and developed their performance when participating in and chairing bilateral and multilateral meetings.

Through *Policy Decision Brief Exercises* the course participants improved their ability to do analysis and to write short decision briefs for high-level decision-makers.

The *Purple Nile Exercise* broadened ITC and ETC participants' understanding of the multifaceted nature of many Peace Support Operations simulating a UN operation in a fictional African country.

Using real world *Peace Operations Case studies*, ITC participants enhanced their understanding of peace support operations and were provided further training in teamwork and communication skills.

In the political-military *Geneva Game*, the ITC and ETC participants were trained in developing policies and actions to be taken by the international community in a simulated crisis in the Balkans.

Participants of the ITC and ETC also received specific training in Media Relations.

1.11. Language Training

Thanks to the generous contributions of both British and French authorities, course participants and selected staff members (and some spouses) were able to follow language-training classes.

Bearing in mind that English is the language of the training courses and that some non-native speakers pass English language exams before they join GCSP courses, we offer English classes only to those participants who need to further improve their knowledge in order to benefit more from the course.

During the 16th ITC, 2 participants needed to improve their knowledge and were offered English classes. Furthermore, 10 participants of the 6th ETC course coming from 9 different countries had the opportunity to brush-up or improve their English knowledge.

As far as French classes are concerned, during the 16th ITC, four French classes were organised: 1 beginners' class of 8 people, 2 intermediate classes of 4 and 3 persons each and 1 advanced class with 4 participants. The 17th ITC comprises two beginners' classes, two intermediates and one advanced (27 participants). Furthermore, 7 participants of the 6th ETC also took an intermediate class.

All in all a total of 65 participants took language classes offered by the GCSP.

2. Research, seminar and platform activities

2.1. Research activities

The primary mission of the GCSP is training or practically-oriented teaching; research is encouraged insofar as it contributes to this, time and staff permitting. In practice the mandate is broadly defined; anything that contributes to the ability of the participants to learn and which helps to deepen the intellectual depth of the faculty, is considered as part of the GCSP's core mission.

Hence the need for faculty members to remain abreast and on top of their academic fields and to attract competent faculty means that in practice research is essential to, and an integral part of, the training function.

This implies that the GCSP does not have a dedicated research programme but seeks to ensure that the faculty is given adequate time and space to pursue their interests, which broadly defined fits into that of the Centre.

Because the Centre lacks the requisite infrastructure and does not publish a journal, it encourages the faculty to continue research and publication in respected (peer-reviewed) journals. Thus the individual faculty have published in such journals as *Survival*, *Security Dialogue* and *Perspectives*. Details can be found on the GCSP website under What's New and under the individual faculty member (which is updated annually).

Besides faculty research, the Centre continues to sponsor conferences or workshops on particular themes related to the teaching curriculum. For example, the workshop in June 2002 on the subject of *Terrorism and Asymmetric war in South West Asia* was co-sponsored with RAND. This was the third GCSP/RAND workshop and its results were published as a RAND paper and widely distributed in autumn 2002. Other workshops on *Europe and its Periphery* and *Peace Support Operations* in 2002 followed the same approach.

The Centre brings together experts to discuss a theme of interest and invites interested participants and faculty to attend. The focus of the GCSP/RAND workshops (in 1999, on NATO beyond Europe; in 2000 on Contemporary Terrorism; 2001 on Turkey and the West; and in 2002 on Terrorism and Asymmetric War in South West Asia) is in each case a broad exchange of views with participants from relevant regions or fields, and the identification of an issue, which bears on Euro-Atlantic security and has not been subject to excessive exposure. The papers commissioned for such workshops (when not covered by the Chatham House rule) are put on the GCSP website for general access. In other cases a conference *rapporteur* summarises the discussion and the GCSP ensures, through co-operation with a co-sponsoring institution, widespread dissemination of the report. At the same time the GCSP encourages faculty members to attend conferences related to the Centre's work. Besides the inevitable networking that this entails, it is believed that the GCSP can benefit from the contacts and from exchanges that both stimulate the faculty and demonstrate in-house competence to those unfamiliar with the GCSP. This outreach function is important but it has to be selective for budgetary reasons as well as other demands on time.

While the Centre has no publications programme as such, it has continued to publish work which it has directly sponsored, e.g. *Russia and the West*, *the West and Russia*, Andrey Vavilov and Joanna Schemm, eds (Zurich: ETH, 2002). While publishing in-house has been considered and tried, and has the advantage of quick turnaround time, its drawback is the demand it makes on in-house resources and especially on the need it creates for an effective targeted distribution system.

In the case of the Yale Workshop, which was held in Kandersteg in 2000 and migrated to Villars in 2002, on the theme Europe and its Neighbourhood, a decision has been made to publish the contributions as Occasional Papers and to seek to revise the papers for publication

in an edited volume through a commercial publisher.

Each approach has its advantage and the Centre may well continue to use both rather than choose between them.

Finally, the GCSP initiated in September a regular contribution (Newsletter) to the Allgemeine Schweizerische Militärzeitschrift (ASMZ).

2.2. *Cluster of Competence*

Members of the GCSP Faculty are involved in a Clusters of Competence Programme established by Switzerland as part of its contribution to the Partnership for Peace Programme (PfP). Due to its expertise in arms control and disarmament, the GCSP has become the flagship for the Arms Control and Disarmament Cluster. The GCSP has united a dozen of experts from its own staff, UNIDIR, GHS, Quaker UN Office, and Pugwash Conferences. The GCSP has also greatly benefited from the expertise of official representatives to the Conference on Disarmament and other governmental bodies, and scholars from non-governmental organisations stationed in Geneva.

This year, the Cluster focused on organizing a workshop on Islam, Islamic Groupings, and the West, which was held 2-3 May 2002. The aim of the workshop was to analyse the causes of political activism in the Arab Muslim world (Islamism), to trace its manifestations and to consider its implications for the west and in particular Europe. Clearly the crisis within Islam and the 'attendant civil war' within the Muslim world is a multifaceted phenomenon. Equally clearly it affects non-Muslims and especially the West which is often the object of its rage, frustration and also interest and envy. Given the proximity of the Islamic Middle East to Europe, the demographic trends in each region and the likelihood that present migration patterns will continue and even intensify, and also given the size of the Muslim community

already existing in Europe (some 15 million), these issues are of considerable concern for most European states.

As is customary, the GCSP invited three sets of participants, Europeans, Americans and people from the region. The workshop was organised around discussion papers and a keynote speech was intended to facilitate thinking about this set of issues, encourage further research and stimulate consideration of the policy implications. (A summary of the conference and the papers can be found on the GCSP website).

2.3. *Austrian and Swiss Security Policy Workshop*

The GCSP hosted the third one-day workshop on Austrian and Swiss security policy issues on 15 April 2002. The workshop, which was held in German, united 17 Swiss and Austrian experts on security policy, governmental officials, as well as selected journalists to discuss the consequences of the events of the 11th of September on the two countries. Papers were presented and discussed on: 1) the geo-strategic context after the 11th of September; 2) the consequences on the security policy of Switzerland, and more specifically on intelligence and crisis management, Armee XXI and on Switzerland as the centre of finance and banking; and 3) the consequences on the security policy of Austria, including special focus on the adaptation in the field of security policy, intelligence and crisis management, and the consequences on civil aviation.

2.4. *The EU and its Neighbourhood*

Project Objectives The principal objective of this research project is to examine the degree to which Western Europe (the European Union and its members states) has been able to respond as a coherent and strategic actor towards the developmental and security needs of its immediate periphery in the post-Cold War pe-

riod. The purpose of the project is to examine the extent to which Europe's ambition to be a strategic actor has been realised in those regions close to its borders.

Background Western Europe has set itself the ambition to respond to three major challenges since the end of the Cold War and the dismantlement of the Iron Curtain:

- Enlargement of the European Union;
- Deepening of the process of integration within the European Union, providing a political union to complement the economic union (CFSP and ESDP); and
- Crisis management of conflicts on its periphery, most notably in the Balkans.

The ambition of the European Union and its member states to assert a more coherent and strategic policy has been driven by its need to integrate central and eastern Europe, its desire to become a more autonomous foreign, security and defence actor, and the practical experience in the Balkans that has confirmed the need for an effective and independent European crisis management capability.

In seeking to develop a coherent strategy towards its periphery, the EU and its member states have had to face a number of difficult challenges. These include: who should the candidates for membership to the EU be? How should policies differ between those countries who are candidates and those who are not? How to deal with regions close to the EU's borders which have suffered from conflicts and warfare and require long-term reconstruction and external commitments? How to convince the publics of the EU states of the strategic importance of such engagement beyond the borders of the EU? And, how to promote and enhance the influence of the EU in relation to other significant actors – such as the United States, Russia and NATO?

The main focus of this research project is towards the regions neighbouring the European

Union. This starts with those countries in central and eastern Europe who are candidates for EU membership and where the integrative engagement of the EU has been most intense. A separate assessment is given to Turkey which is also a candidate but with special characteristics. The non-candidate regions are divided into three: the Balkans region where the EU, along with other institutions, has been engaged in crisis management and post-conflict reconstruction; the countries of the former Soviet Union: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, the Caucasus and Central Asia; and the Mediterranean countries of the so-called Barcelona process.

Approach The key questions which the contributors are asked to pursue in relation to the set of countries or particular region for which they are responsible include:

- How has policy by the European Union and its member states developed towards the region?
- To what extent can the European Union be viewed to have increased its strategic presence and influence?
- What have been the main strengths and weaknesses of EU policy?
- To what extent is the EU acting as the principal actor and to what extent do member states continue to act autonomously from the EU?
- To what extent do other actors – such as the United States, NATO, the UN and OSCE – impinge and influence the activities of the EU?
- To what extent has the EU moved from being a developmental and economic actor to being a politico-security and strategic actor? and
- Overall, to what extent can Europe be seen to be a coherent and strategic actor?

A work in progress meeting took place at the GCSP on 14-15 May 2002 where contributors shared the process of the papers, etc. The research will be published in a book during 2003.

2.5. *Peace Operations after 11 September 2001*

Objectives and Background The seminar is part of a series of seminars that the GCSP organises yearly on the theme of Peace Operations.

In 2002, the Seminar gathered around 25 people (GCSP faculty members, international experts, and practitioners) during one day and a half to debate the issue of the consequences of 11 September on Peace Operations.

The events of 11 September 2001 in the US have had major consequences on security policies and on the way states, international institutions and non-state actors tackle transnational threats such as terrorism, and define their security policies more generally.

The broad range of Peace Operations are directly concerned by this evolution:

- Will the concept of 'intervention' be reconsidered after the terrorist attacks? What will be the role of the UN in this 'new' context, one year after the release of the Brahimi Report on Peace Operations?
- State actors have initiated a process of adaptation in the field of Peace Operations. In this respect, what will be the impact on the US policy towards Peace Operations? On the role of the EU? On the role of NATO? and
- Within Peace Operations, how will the activities of the 'interveners' be affected? Will there be any consequences on the activities of NGOs, or on the way the 'interveners' address the issue of organized crime? Will Peace Operations integrate anti-terrorist activities?

Results The seminar had two kinds of follow-ups. It first led to a Panel at the ISF in Zurich in October 2002. It also led to a book that was edited by Thierry Tardy and will be published at Frank Cass in London (2003) under the title Peace Operations in World Politics after 11 September 2001. Along with Tardy, the authors of the book are the following: Don Daniel, Jolyon Howorth, Jacques Paul Klein, Winrich Kühne, Dick Leurdijk, John MacKinlay, Michael Pugh, Eric Schwartz and Nicholas Stockton.

2.6. *GCSP-RAND Workshop (Asymmetric Threats)*

The 3rd GCSP/RAND workshop on the Middle East and Asymmetric War after September 11th and Afghanistan was held at the Centre on 23-25 June. The focus of discussions was the changed environment after the September 11th attacks on the US and the lessons and implications of the war in Afghanistan, with particular reference to Iraq. This included discussion of 'new terrorism'; the military and technological experience of the Afghan campaign; the possible political repercussions of a war against Iraq and the implications of all of these for Euro-US relations.

The GCSP invited three sets of participants, Americans, Europeans and Middle Easterners and provided them with a set of papers and an environment to stimulate discussion. Discussion of an unfolding event is not always easy but it is all the more necessary given the speed with which the strategic context had been changed by recent events. We intend to continue this series and retain the focus on the greater Middle East, which is assuming central importance in European-American relations. (A summary of the discussions can be found on our website together with the papers.)

2.7. GCSP-Yale University Workshop (Transatlantic Relations after 11 September 2001)

The third meeting on Europe and transatlantic security took place in Villars (Switzerland) on 23-25 August 2002. Fifteen scholars from Yale University, the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva, the GCSP and the University of Oxford exchanged views and produced papers on 1) power, perceptions and politics after September 11th; 2) globalisation and non-state actors; 3) financial flow tracking as an effective measure of counterterrorism, and the opportunities as well as challenges in EU-US cooperation; 4) Afghanistan, terrorism and reconstruction; 5) Europe: becoming a strategic actor? 6) US-European Relations and the Middle East; and 7) US-European relations and Central Asia. A summary of the conference was produced by the GCSP and presented at the International Security Forum, which was held in Zurich between 14-16 October 2002.

2.8. Multicultural Problem Solving

In 2002, the GCSP—on behalf of the Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Centre for International Security Policy)—conducted a research project on “Problem Solving in a Multicultural Environment: Swiss Lessons Learned and their applicability to the Balkan Region” to examine the applicability of lessons learned in Switzerland to other regions, especially the Balkans.

The project aimed at:

- identifying existing lessons learned of Swiss experience in cross-cultural disputes; and
- examining the applicability of these lessons learned to the Balkan region with a special reference to Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH).

The study was designed to reflect a broader representation of other states, especially from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Our intention was to

promote a closer exchange of experts’ views on how the various means of conflict resolution might be applicable or may be adapted to regional situations. The overall goal is to incorporate traditionally grown mechanisms of conflict resolution from other cultures and compare them with the Swiss experience in order to gain more useful and applicable insights.

The project included: 1) a report of Swiss lessons learned by members of the GCSP; 2) comments by three experts coming from the three different communities of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and 3) a seminar including all researchers, as well as additional experts in this field of study.

In its conclusion, the research project stated that the “Swiss Model” cannot be transferred as it is (*tel quel*) to countries in transition or reconstruction. It may help, however, to identify areas which contribute to conflict resolution. This can only be done with the building of local ownership. In this regard, the “Swiss Model” may indicate ways of problem solving mechanisms by looking closer at procedures in Swiss political culture, the army as an integrating factor in a society, the experience of bi- or trilingual cantons and the educational systems on communal level.

The research project “Problem Solving in a Multicultural Environment: Swiss Lessons Learned and their Applicability to the Balkan Region” gave good insights not only to the Swiss mechanism of problem solving, but also on the current situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It also helped to further develop the network GCSP maintains with scholars and policymakers in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

2.9. Brown Bag Lunch on Arms Control

The GCSP, along with such Geneva based organizations as the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), the Graduate Institute of International Studies (GIIS) and the Quaker United Nations, created in 2001 an in-

formal monthly meeting where scholars and practitioners in the broad field of arms control could meet to discuss relevant issues in a timely and casual setting. These meetings are based upon choosing a specific topic for each upcoming month, rendering each monthly discussion time relevant and open to current world events, whereby one speaker is then designated who will briefly introduce the topic and then lead a discussion and question and answer forum. This informal atmosphere takes place during lunch where the GCSP provides water and snacks, but each participant brings his/her own lunch.

The year 2002 saw the interest in this type of meeting increase exponentially. Introductory speakers came from the core group of participants as well as from invitees and experts who were passing through Geneva. Topics included a resume of the 4th Meeting of States Parties to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines; rationale for the US withdrawal from the 1972 ABM Treaty; and Iraq and weapons inspections.

2.10. 5th International Security Forum

The GCSP participated at the 5th International Security Forum (ISF) which took place in Zurich from 14 to 16 October 2002 with four workshops and two side-bar presentations.

Having organized the 4th ISF two years ago in Geneva, last year's forum was organized by the Center for Security Studies and Conflict Resolution in Zurich. The GCSP has been invited to organize four workshops and two side-bar presentations.

The four workshops summarized the research projects conducted throughout the year at the GCSP. The workshops covered the following topics:

- Islam, Islamic Groupings, and the West (Workshop III.2) chaired by Shahram Chubin, Director of Research. This timely panel focused on the relationship between radical groups and Muslims in the West and the issues raised by the presence of Muslims in Western societies for them and for the host societies.
 - Europe as a Regional Actor (Workshop VI.2) chaired by Fred Tanner, Deputy Director. The main purpose of this workshop was to examine the extent to which the European Union and its member states have responded as a coherent and strategic actor towards the developmental and security needs of regions in its immediate vicinity.
 - Asymmetric War in Southwest Asia (Workshop VI.4) chaired by Shahram Chubin, Director of Research. This workshop on asymmetric conflict in Southwest Asia focused on policy approaches, perspectives, and priorities in dealing with conflict in the Persian Gulf region and Afghanistan, with special reference to the future of terrorism and conflict in the region and the Euro-Atlantic policy approaches as they are evolving.
 - Peace Operations in Light of the Events of September 11th (Workshop VI.5) chaired by Thierry Tardy, Faculty Member. This workshop raised and addressed questions on what will be the impact on the United States' policy towards peace operations, on the role of the United Nations, the European Union (EU), and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and how will the activities of the "interveners" be affected within peace operations.
- In addition to the workshops, the side-bar presentations conducted by the GCSP included:
- one which presented the activities of the GCSP. The presentation summarized the main activities of the GCSP in the field of education, research, and networking and gave the new director an opportunity to outline his ambitions for the future.
 - one on the Inter-University Steering Committee on Security Studies in Bosnia and Herzegovina (CSS) in which the GCSP takes part as an academic advisor. The CSS

is an initiative to support security related research activities in BiH and to encourage young researchers to get involved in research activities.

Members of the GCSP who attended the 5th International Security Forum used this platform to present the GCSP's activities and future initiatives to a wider audience. They also profit from the vast possibility to meet with people representing other institutions and to launch new initiatives in the field of collaboration.

2.11. Publications

As mentioned in the introduction to this session on Research, Seminars and Platform Activities, the GCSP does not have the means in and of itself to publish a journal or produce books. It does, however, continue to produce papers under its own Occasional Paper Series. This year, the GCSP Occasional Paper Series produced 10 papers which resulted from a Workshop on the European Union and its Neighbourhood. These papers were prepared for distribution at the 5th International Security Forum in Zurich in October 2002. They, along with other contributions, will be published together in book form in 2003.

In addition, the result of the 2001 Moscow Seminar was published in March 2002 as a Working Paper Special Issue in the ETH, Zurich, Series on Russian Foreign and Security Policy.

You will find a list of each individual faculty member's publications in Annex 16 (for the year 2002), following his/her respective curriculum vitae. A full list can be found on the GCSP website.

2.12. Platform and Conference Activities

Once again the GCSP was kept busy with platform and conference activities in 2002. The impressive list of events (see Annex 15) dem-

onstrates the diversity of the activities undertaken and attended. It also indicates that the GCSP played host to a wide variety of in-house and public lectures provided by faculty members and numerous guest speakers. The practice of involving the main GCSP courses, when programming permits, continued, as did the custom of inviting selected audiences to suit the occasion. The latter were mainly selected from the Geneva-based international organisations, diplomatic missions, non-governmental organisations, academic institutions and, on occasions, the media.

The tradition of selecting subjects of topical interest continues but the choice has to be made very carefully to avoid duplicating the efforts of other institutions similarly engaged. Close liaison, for example, with the Graduate Institute of International Studies and the Swiss Forum for International Affairs remains essential to avoid flooding the market and also to reach a wider audience.

In November the Centre launched a new series of "thematic" platforms entitled "Frozen Conflicts", using Nagorno-Karabakh as the first example. (See following section.)

2.13. Frozen Conflict Series

The GCSP initiated a series of research activities and meetings focusing on frozen conflicts which are defined as non-armed conflicts where conflict resolution has reached a stand-still as, for example, the case of Georgia, Moldova, Nagorno-Karabakh, and others. The frozen conflict series will be composed of three parts of activities with different objectives. First, it will comprise research on case studies, analysing the reasons and background why conflict resolution in those cases has not been successful. Therefore, one objective of the series is to enhance knowledge and contribute to existing (gray) literature. Second, meetings will be organised in the form of work-in-progress meetings to ensure the coherence of the series as well as meetings between parties to conflicts

to facilitate contacts and assess possible paths to breaking the deadlock. Furthermore, the series was initiated to enhance the networking efforts of the GCSP with the academic community, international organisations, and practitioners in the field of conflict management and resolution. The first initial meeting focused on Nagorno-Karabakh in November 2002 and attracted a wide following. Georgia will provide the next focus in the series and will be examined in the context of “security guarantees” at the beginning of June 2003.

3. Networking and Outreach

3.1. PfP Training Center

With regard to the Principal Considerations of the Concept of the PfP Training Centers, the currently recognised Centers continued – also in 2002 – to meet the objectives of the Concept:

- they contribute to overall education and operational training effort in PfP by offering adapted and focussed training, continuously adapted to Partner requirements;
- they develop interoperability of NATO and Partner forces including for NATO-led PfP operations by using commonly defined standards for military training as a reference;
- they contribute to the enhancement of the operational character of PfP by training individuals and units assigned to current theatres of operations;
- they improve PfP training activities through cooperation with other national training institutions; and
- they enhance practical regional cooperation by constituting focal points for regional training and education and contributing to train regional multinational units.

As one of the eight recognised PfP Training Centers, the GCSP worked within this network by attending a workshop in Stockholm (April)

and the Annual Conference at the NATO School SHAPE, Oberammergau (November). During the workshop, the work on key subjects (Definition of Terms, NATO Training, Reporting System and Evaluation Directives) has intensified.

All PfP Training Centers participated in the Annual Conference of the PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes in Paris in June 2002. The GCSP, as tasked by the other centres, introduced the above mentioned objectives and initiatives and linked the PfP Training Centers with the PfP Consortium. Additional items such as Advanced Distributed Learning, Modelling and Simulation, and Curriculum Development have been addressed and considered for future common steps.

Within the framework of the PfP Training Centers, the GCSP maintained and expanded the website – a common tool of communication and information sharing. The PfP TC website (<http://www.gcsp.ch/ptc>) contains information on the member institutions, the courses offered by the centres as well as on the joint activities and assistance.

The GCSP has mainly seen its role in particular as a liaison between the PfP Consortium and the PfP Training Centers since it is active in both bodies and as an information broker among the Centers. Not fitting exactly into the category of (operational) PfP Training Centers, the GCSP offers its services to the broader community of security and defence related training and education institutions. It contributes to the NATO Reporting System in the context of PfP. With its outreach policy, the GCSP contributed with security policy modules to the training programmes of the Diplomatic Academy of Moscow and the Diplomatic Institute of Rome.

3.2. PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes

The PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes is the parent institution of a number of working and study groups

which are dealing with topics related to security and defense education. The key event 2002 was the Annual Conference of the Pfp Consortium, hosted at the Joint Services Defense College (CID) in Paris, 17-19 June 2002. The Working Group on Curriculum Development (WGCD) continued its activities in two major meetings and at the annual conference in Paris. It could count on the help of a working group assistant who basically updated the database on curricula and started to conduct a fact finding project on accreditation, recognition, validation, etc.

This Annual Conference gathered over 400 experts and officials in the field of security policy and incorporated 15 meetings of the working/study groups as well as four mini-workshops. The Working/Study groups presented the results of their activities and defined the future activities. Some of the working groups – such as the Advanced Distributed Learning Working Group (ADL WG) and the Working Group on Curriculum Development (WGCD) – held a joint meeting in order to explore fields of collaboration. The GCSP – together with the ISN-team of the Center for Security Studies and Conflict Research (ETH Zurich) – organized a joint meeting of the ADL Working Group and the Working Group on Curriculum Development. The meeting was devoted to information sharing and elaborating future fields of collaboration.

The mini-workshops served as platform of information sharing on related activities and initiative related to the Consortium. In this framework, the GCSP presented the activities of the Pfp Training Centers which the GCSP is a member of. It gave a presentation on the key activities of the Pfp Training Centers and possible common ground for future collaboration.

The Annual Conference of the Pfp Consortium offered a platform to meet representatives from other institutions and to exchange views. It also gave an embracing overview on the activities of the other working and study groups.

The growing size of the Pfp Consortium – up to 19 Working/Study Groups – shows on the one

hand the necessity of collaboration in this field. On the other hand, the number of working groups has caused serious problems in the support of the working groups' activities by the Pfp Consortium Secretariat. Therefore, the Secretariat Working Group reviewed the activities of all working/study groups in terms of their products and importance to the Consortium. Some of the groups were dissolved others have been urged to merge in order to combine synergies. In this "shrinking" process, the Working Group on Curriculum Development (WGCD) – led by the GCSP – has been assessed as useful and productive. The reduction of the number of working and study groups has been considered essential in streamlining the Pfp Consortium's core activities.

Within the framework of the Pfp Consortium, the GCSP can profit from the training and education related initiatives and activities in the field of security policy. The Consortium allows the GCSP to be involved in a variety of activities which are related to the GCSP's core functions.

The Working Group on Curriculum Development (WGCD) is under the auspices of the Pfp Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies institutes. It is co-chaired by Dr. Fred Tanner, Deputy Director of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP) and Professor Vladimir Sizov, General Staff Academy, Moscow, and administratively supported by the GCSP. It is the main purpose of the WGCD to contribute to the on-going efforts in the EAPC of creating a co-operative network in security education by promoting excellence in curriculum development. Through its work and by assuring diversity of views on curricula developments and teaching in defense and security, the group will foster civil-military relations, and dialogue and understanding in the EAPC area. Given the current drive towards joint military and security policy education, the WG will attempt to create common EAPC standards for courses and other training activities.

In 2002, the Working Group on Curriculum Development held two working group meetings

(at the General Staff College, Hamburg/Germany, March 2002 and at the Land Forces Academy, Sibiu/Romania, Sept. 2002) and organized a joint meeting with the ADL Working Group at the annual conference in Paris (17-19 June 2002). The number of participants in the WGCD has been consolidated and slightly expanded. It includes major academic institutions such as the NATO Defence College, the Joint Services' and Command Staff College, the German General Staff College and the Swedish National Defense College. Furthermore, representatives from Russia, Romania and Bulgaria are regularly attending the meetings of the WGCD.

The main activity of the Working Group was the development of reference curricula on Peace Support Operations, International Humanitarian Law, and Security Threats. They are built upon curricula coming from various institutions and compiled according to a template which has been developed within the WGCD. Reference curricula are seen as contributing to joint curriculum development and have been used as references for the development or revision of courses in some of the institutions.

With regard to its core activities, the Working Group on Curriculum Development made significant progress in:

- ***Amending and Expanding the Database on Curricula*** With the help of a Working Group Assistant, the number of records in the database on curricula has been expanded significantly. The database includes the course offer of the major institutions and provides information on course objectives, target groups, main topics, requirements, contact persons, duration, and other relevant issues. The electronic collection of courses contains link to those courses which are described in details of the institutions' websites.
- ***Creating additional Reference Curricula*** Special importance was given to the development of Reference Curricula on Peace Support Operations, International Humanitarian Law, and Security Threats. The Reference Curricula have been prepared by one of the WGCD members and are built upon curricula coming from institutions and compiled according to a template. They contain commonalities as well as differences on particular subjects. The Reference Curricula have served as a reference for course development or course revision in several institutions, such as the Land Forces Academy at Sibiu, Romania.
- ***Strengthened the Collaboration with the ADL Working Group*** The WGCD and the ADL WG which deals with e-learning and has developed the PfP Learning Management System (LMS) held a joint meeting at the Annual Conference of the PfP Consortium in Paris. The objective of the joint meeting was to exchange information on each group's activities and to identify fields of collaboration. Background of this initiative was the notion that e-learning has to become an integrated part of curriculum development. Fields of collaboration will further be explored between the two working groups, on the level of collaborative sub-groups as well.
- ***Working together with the NATO/PfP Benchmarking Working Group*** As points of contacts, GCSP representatives attended the workshop of the NATO/PfP Benchmarking Working Group, which develops procedures and standards regarding benchmarking as a tool of quality control in teaching and education. The workshop (Führungsakademie, Hamburg) gave insight in the benchmarking procedures used between the Joint Services' Command and Staff College (Shrivenham) and the Führungsakademie der Bundeswehr (Hamburg). Based upon the experiences, procedures, the definition of terms, and standards were proposed. There is a link between the website of the WGCD and the Benchmarking Working Group.
- ***Preparing the field regarding accreditation, recognition, validation, etc.*** At its

meeting in Sibiu, the WGCD decided to conduct a fact finding project on accreditation, recognition, validation, etc. in order to scan the various activities and understanding in this field. The fact finding project has been started by a Working Group Assistant at the end of the year. Its results will be presented at the first WGCD meeting in 2003. The project may be of interest to others as well.

In 2002, collaboration with the Inter-University Steering Committee on Security Studies in Bosnia and Herzegovina (CSS) continued. Members of the CSS attended the meetings of the working group and contributed to its activities. Cooperation was also fostered on a bilateral basis among the universities of BiH and WGCD member institutions.

The position of the co-chairmanship and the secretariat function of the Working Group on Curriculum Development give the Geneva Centre for Security Policy the opportunity to actively set the agenda of the working group and to explore additional fields of curriculum development. It also profits from the variety of members who represent national defense colleges and universities. It also profits from initiatives related to curriculum development such as the NATO benchmarking initiative and the developments regarding e-learning. For the GCSP, the WGCD is an additional platform to disseminate its expertise in an international setting.

3.3. *Inter-University Steering Committee on Security Studies in Bosnia and Herzegovian (CSS)*

The Inter-University Steering Committee on Security Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina (CSS) has been launched by the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to support the research activities of young researchers in security related areas. The CSS includes all six universities of Bosnia and Herzegovina which participate regularly in the meetings. It incorpo-

rates a Scientific Committee which is chaired by Ambassador Istvan Gyarmati, Senior Vice President of Programs and Policy at the Institute for East West Studies.

The GCSP supports the activities of CSS since its beginning. The Deputy Director of the GCSP, Dr. Fred Tanner, acts as an honorary chairman and initiated – in his capacity as co-chair of the Working Group on Curriculum Development (WGCD) – a closer collaboration between the CSS and the WGCD. Members of the CSS attend regularly the meetings of the WGCD and profit from the network regarding the development of new courses. In addition, the GCSP provides financial and advisory support of the secretariat of the CSS. On behalf of the Swiss Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sports (DDPS), the GCSP finances and supervises the CSS secretariat which coordinates the research activities, organises the meeting and assures contacts to the international community. The support of the CSS secretariat turned out to be crucial and important for the functioning of the Committee.

Last year, the Inter-University Steering Committee on Security Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina met four times in order to coordinate its activities. In three cases, the committee convened at the University of Sarajevo (January, April, and December 2002). In July 2002, the CSS meeting was held together with the summer school program of the Center for Security Studies in Neum. The joint meeting allowed combining the teaching activities of the Center for Security Studies with research related initiatives of the CSS. Members of the CSS as Dr. Fred Tanner, Deputy Director GCSP, or Ambassador Istvan Gyarmati, Chairman of the Scientific Council, gave lectures to the students of the summer school coming from the Balkan countries.

Due to the political changes in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the CSS had to review its activities and decided to make the initiative more public in 2003. It has been acknowledged that significant progress was made in the relationship among the universities and their representatives.

Most of the universities are collaborating in many aspects among each other. However, international support – especially financial – is still lacking and needs future initiatives.

3.4. *OSCE Academy, Bishkek*

The OSCE Academy was founded in 2002 according to an initiative of the Kyrgyz Ministry of Education and Culture and the OSCE Center in Bishkek. The GCSP has agreed to support the Academy in the initial phase of its institutional build-up. This is done in close cooperation with the OSCE and a number of European NGOs and research organisations. The GCSP Deputy Director represented the GCSP at the inaugural ceremony that was addressed by numerous distinguished national and international officials, including the President of Kyrgyzstan. The GCSP agreed to support the Academy in terms of curriculum development, lectures and short courses to be held at the Academy. The support of the GCSP is contingent on the Academy's commitment to develop into a politically impartial and truly regional institution.

3.5. *University of Marne-la-Vallée*

In May 2002 an agreement was signed between the GCSP and the University of Marne-la-Vallée in Paris, under which the two institutions have developed close relations.

A student of one of the Master's degree courses of Marne-la-Vallée did an internship at the GCSP during the summer 2002. Further contacts have been made to finalise an exchange programme by which GCSP participants of the International Training Course (ITC) can be simultaneously registered at the University of Marne-la-Vallée in one of the Master's degrees dealing with international relations and security issues. In the year 2002-2003, this has been the case for one ITC participant.

3.6. *Alumni activities*

The **6th ETC Security Policy / Alumni Meeting** was hosted by the GCSP and took place from 21-24 March 2002 in Geneva. The theme was: "Building Peace in South Eastern Europe: A Vision, a Chance or an Illusion"

Approximately forty Alumni (out of 124 former participants) were present with twenty spouses. In addition, the twenty-seven participants and five spouses of the 6th ETC Course as well as sixteen GCSP faculty, staff members and spouses participated in the meeting.

On Thursday 21 of March, the ETC in-house meeting took place at the GCSP. Ambassador Ulrich Lehner welcomed the group, GCSP – ETC Affairs were discussed and were followed by a reception in the cafeteria of the WMO Building.

On Friday morning 22 of March, Ambassador Philippe Welti, Deputy Secretary General, Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport made a presentation entitled "Changing Swiss Security Policy". Ambassador Ulrich Lehner chaired a panel on "Building Peace in South Eastern Europe: A vision, a chance or an Illusion", to which participated Ambassador Jacques Paul Klein, Special Representative of the Secretary General & Coordinator of the UNMBiH in Sarajevo; Ambassador Vladimir Drobnjak, Chairman of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, Working Table for Security, Brussels; and General (ret) Dr. Klaus Reinhardt, Former Commander of KFOR, Germany. After a late lunch, participants had some free time to enjoy Geneva. Ambassador Philippe Welti hosted the dinner which took place at the Hotel des Bergues.

On Saturday, an excursion was organised to Vevey. They visited the Nestlé Museum "Alimentarium" where Mr. Hans-Jörg Renk, Corporate Communications Department, made a presentation on this large worldwide company. The rest of the day was dedicated to a

tourist visit of Vevey and its surroundings, ending at Gruyères where a good-bye dinner took place.

The 11th ITC Security Policy / Alumni Meeting was hosted jointly by the GCSP Ukrainian Government and the GCSP and was held in Kyiv from 6-9 June 2002. The theme was “*Ukraine and the Enlargement of EU and NATO*”

Some forty-five former participants were able to attend from a total of 265 Alumni. Eight spouses also joined the group. Together with the twenty-five participants from the ITC Course 2001-2002, their spouses and the GCSP faculty and staff, approximately ninety-six persons joined this event.

On Thursday 6 of June, participants were met at the airport and settled at Hotel Rus where the meeting took place. At 17h00, the usual in-house GCSP meeting took place and was followed by a friendly dinner.

On Friday morning, the group visited the Antonov Aeronautical Science and Technology Complex (ASTC). Several aircraft were visited. A luncheon took place at the Hotel Rus and the afternoon was devoted to several presentations:

Ukraine’s Foreign policy agenda, by H. E. Ihor Harchenko, Deputy Secretary of State, MFA of Ukraine; *The Euroatlantic integration of Ukraine*, by Dr. Serhiy Pirozhkov, Director of the Ukrainian National Institute of Strategic Studies; *The Ukrainian Defense Reform*, by Col.-Gen. V.I. Bannyh, The Secretary of State of the Ministry of Defence; *Ukraine-EU, the prospects of the dialogue*, by H.E. Olexander Chalyi, Secretary of State for European Integration, MFA of Ukraine, member of the GCSP Foundation Council; *The Ukrainian Arms Industry Conversion*, by Col. O.P. Covtunenکو, Director of the Scientific Research Institute of Arms and Military Technology of the Ukrainian Armed Forces. Ambassador Ulrich Lehner, Director of the GCSP and Dr. Pál Dunay, Director of the ITC Course, made some closing remarks and thanked our hosts for this very interesting

meeting. After the group photo, everyone was invited to a cruise on the River Dneiper. A formal dinner on board was hosted by H.E. Olexander Chalyi.

On Saturday, the group visited Kyiv and the Museum of the historic treasures of Kyiv-Pecherska Lavra. Luncheon took place in the Restaurant Tsarske selo. In the evening, participants of the meeting were invited to the National Opera of Ukraine. The National Choir of Ukraine sang several songs. The group left on Sunday 9 June 2002.

The 2nd NISC Security Policy / Alumni Meeting was hosted by the GCSP in Geneva from 13-16 June 2002. The theme was “*11th September and New Security Issues Agenda*”. 12 former participants out of 52 alumni were able to join this reunion. With the 19 participants of the NISC 2002 course and GCSP Faculty and Staff, a group of approximately 40 persons participated in this meeting.

As usual, it started with the in-house GCSP meeting on Thursday 13 June which was opened by Ambassador Ulrich Lehner, Director of the Centre, and followed by a reception at La Perle du Lac, by the Geneva Lake. Friday was devoted to different presentations. Ambassador Philippe Welti, Director of the Security and Defence Policy, Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport, Bern, started with the presentation “Changing Swiss Security Policy”. On the subject of September 11th and New Security Issues, *Human Security* was presented by Professor Keith Krause, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva; Professor S. Neil MacFarlane, Director of the NISC Course, presented *Global Justice* in the morning; and in the afternoon, *Restoring Order or the Rule of Law* and *Regional Security in Central Asia* were presented respectively by Dr. Rama Mani, Senior Strategy Adviser, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Geneva and Dr. Roland Dannreuther, Senior Lecturer at the University of Edinburgh and former Director of the NISC Course. Dinner took place at the Hotel des Bergues.

The Saturday excursion took the participants to the national Exhibition of Switzerland "Expo02" in Neuchâtel. The luncheon was organised on board of a boat from Neuchâtel to Morat where the group visited the exhibition where the Federal Ministry of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport had a Stand. On the way back to Geneva, dinner was offered at l'Auberge du Château de Nyon. On Sunday 16 June, participants returned home.

3.7. *Cyber News*

The GCSP continues to focus on IT to promote diplomacy and security policy expertise. This year the GCSP further elaborated the content of the GCSP website, established new mediums of communicating information and created a new digital library.

This year the GCSP has continued to improve the GCSP website by improving the "What's New" page, making it clearer and more accessible to outside readers. The GCSP policy briefs have also been updated this year, notably the ones covering NATO, EU, WEU, OSCE and the Council of Europe. New policy briefs have also been added on International Relations Theory and Security Policy and on Traditional and Non-Traditional Security Issues in Latin America: Evolution and Recent Developments.

The GCSP is continuing an Electronic Newsletter which is sent out every two months to a select list of Foundation members, Alumni and colleagues. This electronic newsletter functions as a means to keep the GCSP community network informed about all the recent events that have occurred at the Centre. Its purpose is to inform the GCSP community of new publication series, new platform speakers, new course offerings, GCSP Press contributions and to keep everyone informed about our annual alumni meetings.

The GCSP has recently collaborated with the Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) and with the Centre for

Security Politics to design a new GCSP Digital Library. This new digital library is based on a proto-type designed by DCAF and created by the Centre for Security Policy. The digital library consists of two databases: one database is open to the public and the second one will be for internal use only. The first database will be available through a link on the GCSP website. This database will consist of a digital catalogue of all the books that the GCSP currently has in its library as well as a list of all journals, monographs, working papers and e-journals. In order to look up books, the database can either be searched by region, subject, author, title, or language. The second database will be closed to the public. Its purpose is to create an administrative process for ordering books.

In the future, the GCSP is interested in exploring many new mediums of information which could be disseminated through the GCSP website. Video presentations of GCSP management, faculty and platform speakers as well as audio clips of interviews of GCSP management staff, faculty, guest lecturers and platform speakers which could help extend channels of information to those interested in the work of the GCSP.

The GCSP website continues to act as a platform for the work of the Centre, a research tool, a networking tool as well as a teaching tool for future course participants. The website therefore builds upon creating a more informed, educated and connected "Cyber Community."

3.8. *E-learning / Prep-Kit*

Last year, the three major courses offered so-called "PrepKits" – on-line available preparation tools which are specifically designed for incoming participants. The objective of these PrepKits are to deliver tailor-made information to our participants in order to inform them on the course outline, the requirements regarding the course, the GCSP as an institution and how to live in Geneva. The websites have been designed along the specific characteristics of the

courses to disseminate information on the ITC, ETC and NISC in due time.

The PrepKits have been well received by the course participants. They esteem the electronic platform as an adequate tool for preparation. The PrepKits have been adopted according to the wishes of the participants.

In 2002, the GCSP entered also into the e-learning business. It established an e-learning portal on the GCSP website which is accessible to all Alumni and future participants. The Learning Management System (LMS) – the technical backbone for the teaching activities on the Internet – was developed within the PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes and supported by the International Relations and Security Network (ISN) at the Center for Security Studies in Zurich. The ISN-team provided also technical and methodological support in creating e-learning modules.

The GCSP was conducting a testing phase by, first, offering some stand-alone e-learning modules and, second, conducting an instructor-guided e-learning course on NATO enlargement. Both, the stand-alone modules – which include topics such as European Security and Defence Policy and conflict management – as well as the instructor-guided course gave valuable insights on how to conduct courses through the internet. They served as test-beds to further developing the “e-learning policy” which will determine how the GCSP will use e-learning in complementation to the residential courses. Most of the reactions coming from the GCSP alumni were encouraging in continuing to offer a e-learning basis. However, online courses will have to be “combined” with the classroom activities – also in view of offering executive courses in order to make best use of the GCSP teaching facilities. For more information, see:

<http://www.gcsp.ch/itc>
<http://www.gcsp.ch/etc>
<http://www.gcsp.ch/nisc>

4. Organisation

4.1. Personnel

As of December 31, 2002, the personnel head-count was 33 employees. Within the GCSP Staff, the following changes have been made:

Management

Ambassador Ulrich Lehner left the Centre on August 31, 2002 at the end of his 4 year mandate. His successor, Ambassador Gérard Stoudmann took over his function as Director of the Centre on October 14, 2002.

Faculty

Prof. Andrei Zagorski joined the GCSP on January 1, 2002, and left on November 30, 2002.

Prof. Neil MacFarlane has been hired on a 4 months per year basis to teach the NISC course (from April 1 to July 31, 2002).

Faculty support

Ms. Pia Diethelm left on March 31, 2002 and was replaced by Ms. Sigrid Chatton on September 1, 2002.

To reinforce the Platform organization, Ms. France Menétrey has been hired as a Faculty Assistant on March 18, 2002.

Accounting

Mr. Mario Freire left on December 31, 2002 and was replaced by Ms. Viviane Savia who took over financial services as of October 1, 2002.

Human Resources

Mr. Sandy Beetschen joined the Human Resource team on April 1, 2002 as Human Resource Assistant.

Associate Faculty

Two additional external consultants were hired to provide their teaching expertise and lectures not available within the resident Faculty members:

Dr. John C. Gault, as of October 21, 2002

Dr. Peter Batchelor, as of November 27, 2002

Faculty and Staff Summary – Jan. - Dec. 2002

Faculty

LEHNER Ulrich, Director (- Aug. 2002)

STOUDMANN Gérard, Director (Oct. 2002 -)

TANNER Fred, Deputy Director, Head of Academic Affairs

CHUBIN Shahram, Director of Research

DAVISON Richard, Faculty Member

DUNAY Pal, Director, International Training Course

HUBNER Michael, Director, European Training Course

HYLLANDER Jan, Faculty Member

MACFARLANE Neil, Director, New Issues in Security Course

NARICH Richard, Faculty Member

POPE Michael, Faculty Member

TARDY Thierry, Faculty Member

ZAGORSKI Andrei, Faculty Member

Associate Faculty

GAULT John, President, John Gault SA, Geneva

GHEBALI Victor-Yves, Professor, Political Science, Graduate Institute of International Studies (GIIS), Geneva

BATCHELOR Peter, Project Director, Small Arms Project, GIIS, Geneva

Academic Support

BESSARD Sophie, Assistant, External Relations and Conferences

CHATTON Sigrid, Assistant to the Deputy Director

DIETHELM, Pia, Assistant to the Deputy Director

GOLAY Evelyne, Administrator, Training Programmes

LEHMANN Patrick, Project Coordinator, Partnership for Peace (PfP)

MATHYS Birgit, External Relations and Conference Manager

MENETREY France, Faculty Assistant

PINTER-KRAINER Nicole, Project Coordinator

ROULIN-TACHET Arlette, Assistant to the Director, Alumni affairs

SCHEMM Joanna, Research Officer, Publications

SCHORI-LIANG Christina, Head, Information and Public Relations

Administrative Support

BEETSCHEN Sandy, Assistant, Human Resources

DERRON Claude, Administrator

FLEURY-R. Françoise, Head, Computer Operations

FREIRE Mario, Accounting

FUNDA Muriel, Head, Human Resources

HUMBERSET Alexandra, Receptionist

LANDOW Andrew, Assistant, Computer Operations

SAVIA Viviane, Accounting

SCHÜRCH Gottlieb, Logistics
 SPYR Roland, Logistics
 SURBER Patrick, Assistant, Computer Operations

4.2. *The Foundation Council*

The Foundation Council held its meetings on 10 June and 4 December 2002. At these sessions, two new members of the Council were elected: for Austria, Hon. Prof. DDr. Erich Reiter and for Lithuania, Ambassador Dr. Algimantas Rimkūnas.

The GCSP Foundation welcomed seven new members during 2002. At its meeting on 4 December, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Spain and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, now Serbia and Montenegro, joined the Foundation. By the end of 2002, 28 countries from the Euro-Atlantic area and the canton of Geneva were members of the GCSP Foundation (see Annex 17).

At the spring session of the Council, the director presented the GCSP's 2001 Annual Report.

At the fall meeting, the new GCSP Director Ambassador Gérard Stoudmann, was welcomed by the President of the Council. The president also recognised the excellent work of his predecessor, Ambassador Ulrich Lehner. The new Director presented his concept for the future activity of the GCSP and the budget for the year 2003. The Council members approved both documents.

Foundation Council – as of Dec. 2002

Chairman

Professor **François Heisbourg**, Director, Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique, Paris

Bureau of the Council

Professor **François Heisbourg**, Director, Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique, Paris (Chairman)

Ambassador **Theodor H. Winkler**, Director, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Geneva (Secretary of the Council)

Ambassador **Christian Faessler**, Head of the Swiss Delegation to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva (Treasurer of the Council)

Ambassador **Hubert de La Fortelle**, Permanent Representative of France to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Prof. Dr. **Timothy Harding**, Director, Institute for Legal Medicine, University of Geneva

Members of the Council

Albania

Ambassador **Vladimir Thanati**, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Albania to the UN and other International Organisations in Geneva

Armenia

Ambassador **Zohrab Mnatsakanian**, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the UN and other International Organisations in Geneva

Austria

Hon.-Prof. DDr. **Erich Reiter**, Head, Direction for Security Policy, Federal Ministry of Defence of Austria, Vienna

Azerbaijan

Ambassador **Araz Azimov**, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Baku

Belgium

Cdt. **Joseph Van den put**, Commanding Officer, Belgian Royal defence College, Brussels

Bulgaria

Ambassador **Dimitër Tzantchev**, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Bulgaria to the UN and other International Organisations in Geneva

Czech Republic

Mr. **Stefan Füle**, First Deputy Minister of Defence, Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic, Prague, and, as of 4.12.2002 Mr. Ing. **Jaroslav Škopek**, First Deputy Minister of Defence, Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic, Prague

Denmark

Mr. **Kristian Fischer**, Deputy Permanent Secretary of State for Defence (International Affairs), Ministry of Defence, Copenhagen.

Estonia

Mr. **Margus Kolga**, Deputy Secretary General, Ministry of Defence, Policy and International Relations, Tallinn

Finland

Ambassador **Markku Reimaa**, Permanent Representative of Finland to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

France

Ambassador **Hubert de La Fortelle**, Permanent Representative of France to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Federal Republic of Germany

Brigadier-General **Jürgen Bornemann**, Deputy Assistant Chief of Armed Forces Staff III, Federal Ministry of Defence, Berlin

Hungary

Mr. **József Bali**, Deputy State Secretary for Defence Policy, Ministry of Defence, Budapest

Italy

Ambassador **Mario Maiolini**, Permanent Representative of Italy to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Latvia

Mr. **Janis Karlsbergs**, Defence Adviser, Representative of the Ministry of Defence of Latvia to OSCE, Vienna

Lithuania

Ambassador **Algimantas Rimkunas**, Permanent Representative of Lithuania to the UN and other International Organisations in Geneva

Poland

Ambassador **Krzysztof Jakubowski**, Permanent Representative of Poland to the UN and other International Organisations, and to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Romania

Ambassador **Ioan Maxim**, Embassy of Romania, Bern

Russian Federation

Ambassador **Leonid Skotnikov**, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the UN and other International Organisations, and to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Serbia and Montenegro

Mr. **Vuk Žugić**, Assistant Foreign Minister for Multilateral Affairs, Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Serbia and Montenegro, Belgrade

Slovak Republic

Ambassador **Kálmán Petöcz**, Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic to the UN and other International Organisations, and to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Spain

Ambassador **Carlos Miranda**, Permanent Representative of Spain to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Sweden

Colonel GS **Lars-Gunnar Nilsson**, Defence Attaché, Swedish Embassy, Bern

Switzerland

Lieutenant-General **Hans-Ulrich Scherrer**, Chief of the General Staff, Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sports

Ambassador **Theodor H. Winkler**, Director, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Geneva (Secretary of the Council)

Ambassador **Christian Faessler**, Head of the Swiss Delegation to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva (Treasurer of the Council)

Dr. **Karl Haltiner**, Lecturer, Military Command School, Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich

Turkey

Ambassador **Turan Morali**, Director General, International Security Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey, Balgat, Ankara

Ukraine

Mr. **Olexandr Chalyi**, First Deputy Foreign Minister of Ukraine, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Kyiv

United Kingdom

Ambassador **Basil Eastwood**, Embassy of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Bern

United States of America

Colonel **David S. Brackett**, Air Attaché, Embassy of the United States, Bern and as of 09.12.2002, Col. **Stefan M. Aubrey**, Defense and Army Attaché, Embassy of the United States of America, Bern

Canton of Geneva

Dr. **Jean Freymond**, Director, Center for Applied Studies in International Negotiations (CASIN), Geneva

Prof. Dr. **Timothy Harding**, Director, Institute for Legal Medicine, University of Geneva

4.3. Visiting Scholars and Interns

The GCSP has hosted two visiting scholars in 2002. One of the visiting scholars was supported by the Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes and worked mostly on building up the database for the Curriculum Development Group of the PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes. Other tasks included working on a fact finding mission for accreditation of courses in the security policy field. The second scholar was invited to the GCSP due to a special agreement between the GCSP and the Université de Marne la Vallée. The agreement stipulates that the GCSP will host one visiting scholar from Marne-la-Vallée per year for two months. This agreement was carried out last year when Marne-la-Vallée sent one of its students to the GCSP to finish his masters thesis.

During the year 2002 the GCSP has hosted twelve interns. Both faculty and staff have been able to benefit from their support. Interns have proven to be invaluable in maintaining the GCSP website. Interns have assisted in translating presentations and entries and have helped to update links for the website. Interns have also helped build up the Prep Kits for the ITC, ETC and NISC courses. They assisted in creating the website for the PfP Training Centers. Interns have aided with GCSP's e-learning efforts. Interns are also active in research activities. They support staff in researching specific topics for faculty presentations as well as assist in preparation for documentation and course readings for the GCSP courses and course participants. Finally, interns have been very active in doing data entry for the new GCSP digital library database.

Interns generally work two to three days a week for three months at a time. Paid interns work full time for one to two months. In the future, the GCSP is working on formalizing agreements with partner institutions to include special arrangements for hosting interns.

4.4. Infrastructure

Advances made in the domain of Information Technology were reflected in activity at the centre. A major transition, accomplished with no network downtime, took place this year involving the migration of all workstations from Windows NT to Windows XP. Resulting benefits include improved network stability as well as better compatibility with current software applications and hardware. Also, an expansion unit was installed that provides 200GB of storage capacity.

The combination of several hardware and software additions greatly contributed to improving network security. A new firewall was installed and configured with updated software. Also, a MailSweeper was integrated into the system that filters viruses from email before they arrive at the main Outlook Exchange postoffice.

Lastly, a robotic tape backup system was added to complement the increased disk capacity and to ensure consistent, automated backups every night of the week.

5. Accounts

The 2002 accounts of the GCSP show total cash contributions of Sfr. 6.623.751 and total expenditure of Sfr. 6.624.150.

The surplus of the last year (Sfr. 250.143), less the deficit for the current year (Sfr 399) will be used to pay for the office modifications and other projects in 2003.

| GCSP Income | Amount |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Contributions DDPS | 5.708.332 |
| Contributions DFAE | 155.014 |
| Contributions GICHD | 174.299 |
| Contributions United Kingdom | 84.942 |
| Contributions France | 69.547 |
| Contributions Finland | 0 |
| Contributions DCAF | 200.000 |
| Contributions UCLA | 0 |
| Contributions Voie Creuse | 0 |
| Contributions DFAE IISS | 0 |
| | 6.392.134 |
| Interests | 2.817 |
| Other Income | 218.155 |
| Unexpected Income | 10.645 |
| | |
| Total Income | 6.623.751 |

| GCSP Expenses | Amount |
|---|------------------|
| Personnel expenses | 3.468.492 |
| Corporate Membership and IUHEI | 25.978 |
| Courses | 1.754.992 |
| Equipment acquired | 114.064 |
| Running costs | 718.111 |
| Other courses and costs | 476.792 |
| Bank charge | 884 |
| | |
| Contributions transferred to following year: | |
| Contributions DDPS | 15.000 |
| Contributions United Kingdom | 37.037 |
| Contributions DFAE | 0 |
| Contributions France | 12.800 |
| | 64.837 |
| Total Expenses | 6.624.150 |
| | |
| INCOME/LOSS FOR THE YEAR | -399 |