



PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE MEDITERRANEAN
ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE DE LA MEDITERRANEE
الجمعية البرلمانية للبحر الأبيض المتوسط

1st Standing Committee on Political and Security related cooperation

“Constitutional Changes in Bosnia and Herzegovina”

Rapporteur: Hon. Miro Petek (Slovenia)

Report discussed on 29 October 2011, during the VI Plenary Session, Palermo

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF "DAYTON BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA"

1. Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) as a state of two Entities – **the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska** – has revived after 1995 through the General Framework Agreement for Peace, also known as the **Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA)** which was initialled on 21 November 1995 in Dayton and signed on 14 December 1995 in Paris. Bosnia and Herzegovina is administratively divided into: the Federation encompassing 51% of the territory, the Republika Srpska encompassing 49% of the territory, and a special administrative unit, the Brčko District. The Federation is comprised of 10 cantons or counties (Una-Sana, Posavina, Tuzla, Zenica-Doboj, Bosnian Podrinje, Central Bosnia, Herzegovina-Neretva, West Herzegovina, Sarajevo and Herzeg-Bosnian) which are composed of 84 municipalities; the Republika Srpska is administratively divided in 5 districts (Banja Luka, Doboj, Bijeljina, Pale and Trebinje) which are further divided in 64 municipalities.

2. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a multiethnic state which should according to the last population census as of 1991 have a population of 4.4 million of which 44% are Bosniacs, 31% Serbs, 17% Croats and 8% other national communities.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

3. The Dayton Agreement has established two Entities and weak state institutions.

The Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina is set forth in **Annex 4 to the Dayton Peace Agreement**. The legal existence and constitutional structure of BiH as a sovereign, independent

and internationally recognised state are provided by a part of the international agreement. **Annex 4 recognises also the international and legal continuity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina which declared its independence in 1992** and was granted membership in the UNO in May of the same year, together with Slovenia and Croatia. According to the international law, Bosnia and Herzegovina, established with the Dayton Agreement, is not a new country – what is new is its internal and political structure in the framework of internationally recognized borders of 1992 which is determined in the Annex 4 to the Dayton Agreement as well.

4. The sovereignty of BiH which should be based on the implementation of powers over the population and territory is divided in two Entities. The population of each Entity shall elect their representatives to the parliaments of individual Entities which form the government. The Entities shall have the right to establish relationships with neighbouring states, provided it is consistent with the Constitution of BiH or confirmed by the Parliamentary Assembly of the state BiH. The Entities govern also other areas not explicitly and originally assigned in the Constitution to the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

5. Annex 10 (*Agreement on Civilian Implementation of the Peace settlement*) to the Dayton Peace Agreement specifies also the responsibilities of the High Representative of the international community. If no consensus is to be reached on a certain important issue, the High Representative may on the basis of his Bonn powers, deriving from Annex 10 to the Dayton Peace Agreement and the guidelines of the Peace Implementation Council (PIC), reach interim binding decisions. ~~As a matter of fact, with the Dayton Peace Agreement the state became an international protectorate (SERBIA).~~

6. **The following matters are the responsibility of BiH:** foreign policy, national defence, foreign trade policy, customs policy, monetary policy, finances and international obligations, emigration and refugee policy, international and inter-Entity criminal law enforcement, including relations with Interpol, common and international communications facilities, inter-Entity transportation, air traffic control, **out of which six are based on the Dayton Peace Agreement, whereas the rest (around 80) are centralized by the acts of the High Representative (SERBIA).**

7. The Parliamentary Assembly of BiH, as the **Legislative Branch of Power**, is compound of two chambers. **House of Peoples**, the upper house of the Parliamentary Assembly, comprises 15 Delegates (five of each constituent people who are selected indirectly from the House of Peoples of the Federation and the National Assembly of the Republika Srpska), and the **House of Representatives** which has 42 members, 28 from the Federation and 14 from the Republika Srpska. All legislation procedures shall require the approval of both chambers.

8. Pursuant to the constitutional procedure, for both chambers the adoption of laws or individual proposals shall be by the majority vote, with a condition that the majority voting

"affirmative" includes at least one-third of representatives from each Entity. Otherwise, the Chair shall attempt to, within three days, obtain approval on the proposal. If these efforts fail, decisions shall be taken again within three days by the majority vote, provided that the dissenting votes do not include two-thirds of the delegates from either Entity. The decision of the Parliamentary Assembly shall be approved by the House of Peoples. A decision in the Parliamentary Assembly shall require for approval a majority of the voting members of all three nationalities. If the majority of representatives of an individual nationality objects to the proposed decision, the Chair shall immediately convene negotiations at the level of representatives of all three nationalities. If they fail to resolve the issue within five days, the matter shall be referred to the Constitutional Court, which shall review the issue.

9. **The Presidency of BiH** shall consist of three Members: one Bosniac, one Croat, and one Serb. The Presidency shall endeavour to adopt decisions by a consensus, nevertheless, when this is not possible, a decision may be adopted, if two Members of the Presidency vote "affirmative" or "negative". The Member of the Presidency who does not approve the result of voting or disapproves it may within three days of its adoption demand that the decision shall be referred to the parliament of the Entity. If the parliament of the Republika Srpska or the Federation rejects the Presidency Decision by a two-thirds vote, the challenged Presidency Decision shall not take effect. This type of voting is referred to as **entity voting**.

10. The Presidency shall have responsibility for conducting the foreign policy of BiH, appointing ambassadors and other international representatives, representing the state in international organizations and institutions, negotiating, and, with the consent of the Parliamentary Assembly, ratifying treaties, executing decisions of the Parliamentary Assembly, proposing, upon the recommendation of the Council of Ministers of BiH, the annual budget to the Parliamentary Assembly, coordinating relations with international and non-governmental organizations, performing other functions assigned to it by the Parliamentary Assembly, or as may be agreed by the Entities. The Presidency of BiH shall nominate the Chair of the Council of Ministers, who shall be approved by the Parliamentary Assembly. The Presidency of BiH carries out collectively the function of the civilian Commander in Chief over armed forces of BiH.

11. **Council of Ministers BiH** is charged with overseeing foreign, economic and fiscal policy and represents the national government. The Chair of the Presidency shall nominate the Chair or Prime Minister of the Council of Ministers of BiH who shall nominate Ministers – the nominations shall be approved by the House of Representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH. No more than two-thirds of all Ministers may be appointed from the territory of the Federation. Each Minister shall have two Deputy Ministers who shall not be of the same nationality as their Ministers.

12. **The Constitutional Court** shall have nine members, three from the Federation, three from the Republika Srpska and three members shall be selected by the European Court of Human Rights. The Court shall decide by a majority of all votes. It decides any dispute that arise

between the Entities or between institutions of BiH (i.e. whether an Entity's parallel relationship with a neighbouring state or laws are consistent with the Constitution or not). A decision of the Constitutional Court shall be final and binding. The Court shall decide on conformity not only with the Constitution, but also with the European Convention for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. **Based on agreement between Catherine Ashton, High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and Milorad Dodik, President of the Republic of Srpska, on May 13, a Special Commission would address these issues. (SERBIA)**

III. FIRST ISSUES CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

13. **First issues on the necessity to (or not) change the Dayton Constitution** arose in media and civil society at the beginning of the previous decade. It had been often mentioned that changes should be adopted at an international conference (usually the term "Dayton II" was used), where according to the discussers' opinion domestic factor should, in contrast to 1995, play a more significant role, **respecting the fact that any change must be accepted by all three constitutional peoples. (SERBIA)**

14. What is more, political representatives of the Bosniacs were advocating changes which should proceed in the direction of strengthening the competences of the state BiH and of providing better functioning of state institutions. The Serbs were accusing the Bosniacs that they were bothered by the Dayton Republika Srpska and that their intention were merely an attempt to abolish the two Entities and to centralise Bosnia and Herzegovina, whereas the Croat politicians did not particularly expose themselves in the initial discussions on the Constitution.

15. The first serious attempt of a constitutional reform occurred in **September 2003** and was launched by a group of intellectuals (academics and professors under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Sabitović) who had prepared the **draft declaration on necessity of changes to constitution** which defined Bosnia and Herzegovina as a federal republic. They had discovered that it was necessary to hold up the disintegration processes and to participate in the Euro-Atlantic integration as soon as possible. According to their opinion, the Dayton Constitution were a generator of instability in the state and a factor that prolonged the crisis in BiH. Furthermore, the sharp political struggles for more competences of Entities were not in the interest of Bosnians nations, they served only the narrow political elite connected with corruption and crime. In the framework of the Academy of Science and Arts of BiH the same group put forward concrete proposals for the constitutional changes which were later on transferred to the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH for a discussion, however, were not realised due to the antagonism between nations and the two Entities.

IV. "APRIL PACKAGE"

16. In November 2005, numerous events commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Dayton Peace Agreement took place in Washington. Under the auspices of US Secretary of State Ms Condoleezza Rice, three members of the then Presidency of BiH and leaders of eight political parties reached an agreement and signed a "**declaration on the urgency of constitutional changes**". In the statement they agreed to continue with the reform policy and introduction of changes that were necessary for BiH to become a full member of the EU and NATO. Politicians in BiH were bound by the text to reach an agreement on urgent changes of the Constitution of BiH by March 2006 at the latest. Pursuant to the agreement, the competences of state institutions in BiH should be strengthened and extended, the Council of Ministers of BiH should be changed into the state government with the prime minister, and greater efficiency of the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH should be facilitated; moreover, the role of the Presidency of BiH should be limited in particular to protocol representation of the state.

17. On the basis of the declaration and under the auspices of the US Embassy in Sarajevo, intense negotiations among the leading parliamentary parties (SDA – the Party of Democratic Action, SDS – the Serbian Democratic Party, HDZ – the Croatian Democratic Union, PDP – the Party of Democratic Progress, SDP – the Social Democratic Party, and SNSD – the Alliance of Independent Social Democrats) on the model of the constitutional reform were held in March and April 2006. In April 2006, the leaders of all six parties reached an agreement on several changes to the text of constitutional amendments and ensured that 27 deputies (out of 42) from their parties in the House of Representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH would support the changes and vote for the constitutional amendments.

18. On the basis of the agreement among the representatives of political parties, the Presidency of BiH also expressed its support to the changed text of amendments; the Constitutional and Legal Commission of the House of Representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH also approved in principle the constitutional amendments. However, when voting was held on 26 April 2006, the constitutional amendments did not receive a necessary number of votes and were not adopted in spite of the firm conviction of the then Chair of the Presidency of BiH Mr Tihic (SDA).

19. Serb deputies supported the "April package" of the constitutional reform unanimously. The majority of Croat deputies and the Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina voted against it. Voting on the constitutional reform caused a division in the Croat political body, which divided itself into the existing HDZ and the new HDZ 1990.

20. Dodik (SNSD) continued to express his full support to the April package also later. He suggested that new negotiations on a completely new proposal for constitutional changes be held in case that the April package would not be voted on again. Tihic proposed the April package be adopted with one amendment relating to entity voting or its reduction.

21. In principle, the April package corresponded to enlargement requirements of the EU since it would have given necessary legislative powers to the state responding to the requirements of EU integration. All parties agreed that it would be necessary to double a number of members of the House of Representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH, thus enabling a larger number of committees to supervise the adoption of legislation for integration into the EU. **However, the consent regarding the reform of entity voting and voting under the national interest protection system was not reached.** The Venice Commission established that it had been unreal to expect that these two mechanisms would be abolished. According to the Commission, however, it could have been better defined when the use of these blocking mechanisms was more appropriate.

22. Due to the police reform, any concrete discussion on the reform of the Dayton Constitution was put aside in the second half of 2006 and in the first half of 2007. The then High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina Mr Schwarz Schilling attempted to revive the discussion on the constitutional reform before the expiry of his term (June 2007), but without success. Although political parties continued to agree that the reform was necessary for the state to function effectively and to move closer to joining the Euro-Atlantic structures, enough political will was lacking for something more.

23. It became evident that the Republika Srpska only consented to the federal structure of the country divided into three or more federal units, whereby the Republika Srpska would remain in the existing frames and the Croats would get their federal unit in the territory of the Federation of BiH. Bosniac politicians (SBIH and SDA), led by Silajdzic (SBIH) advocated a unitarian state, divided into at least five regions. At the same time, Bosniac national parties demanded that the voting system be changed while defending individual rights before national or entity rights.

V. "PRUD PROCESS"

24. In 2007, Bosnia and Herzegovina experienced a deep political crisis. With the aim to meet the conditions for the police reform and to initial the Stabilisation and Association Process, the first wider political agreement was reached, signed on 28 October 2007 in Mostar by six leaders of the government coalition parties: Dodik (SNSD), Ivanic (PDP), Silajdzic (SBIH), Tihic (SDA), Covic (HDZ), Ljubic (HDZ 1990). Therefore it was named the "Mostar Declaration".

25. The next logical step for BiH was an agreement on the constitutional reform upon which the signatories of the "Mostar Declaration" failed to reach an agreement (the Serbs were in favour of the establishment of the Croat entity but not on the account of the Republika Srpska; HDZ wanted the fourth entity (Sarajevo) in addition to the Croat one; SDA defended the April package strengthening the institutions of BiH; SBiH advocated the division of BiH). Since SDA, HDZ and SNSD failed to find compromise solutions promoted from the inside, i.e. by local ownership, they decided to launch a new project. On November 2008, heads of the leading political parties Tihić, Čović and Dodik prepared a draft political agreement in Prud:

- **Constitutional Reform:** the new Constitution is not necessary – the reform to be carried out on the basis of amendments to the existing (Dayton) Constitution. The subject of discussions on the constitutional reform: harmonisation of the Constitution with the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, defining the competences of the state, functioning of institutions in BiH, and the territorial organisation of the central level of authority.

- **Census:** pursuant to the law to be carried out in 2011 in the entire territory of BiH and in accordance with EU requirements. Census should also include questions on national affiliation, religion and mother tongue. Findings of the census should be taken into consideration no earlier than in 2014 (by then, the national composition in state, entity, cantonal and municipal authorities and public administration will remain in line with the census of 1991; between 2009 and 2011, the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH is to adopt a programme of measures for assistance in lasting return of refugees and displaced persons).

- **State property:** divided according to OHR recommendations – immovable property necessary for the work of state institutions, including defence property, booked for the benefit of the state BiH (the remaining property is to be distributed to entities, cantons and municipalities).

- **Brčko District:** the status to be solved on the basis of the constitutional act adopted with a two-thirds majority.

- **Budget adoption:** the Fiscal Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina has all the support to set the budgetary framework for 2009.

26. Aiming to implement the Prud Agreement, Tihić, Čović and Dodik met several times. However, in the first half of 2009 more and more tensions occurred culminating in August 2009, so the Prud process remained uncompleted.

27. Six political parties in BiH, mostly Croat ones, signed the Kreševo Declaration on 21 September 2007 representing the official platform of the Croat parties for the constitutional reform. However, the declaration was too general and, consequently, allowed for different interpretations – its main point was to highlight the need for the establishment of a new

functional and fairer arrangement of BiH, according to which none of the constituent people of BiH would be either privileged or discriminated.

VI. "BUTMIR PROCESS"

28. The Butmir process was an initiative launched by the EU (the Swedish Presidency and the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union) and US in the second half of 2009 with a view to stimulate political actors to reach an agreement. Aiming to overcome the state of blockades and standstill on the path to Euro-Atlantic integrations, the initiative joined two goals:

1. Endeavours made by the EU to meet the conditions for closure of the OHR and for transition to an EU presence (out of five conditions only one remained unfulfilled, namely the division of state and defence property).
2. Endeavours for the constitutional reform (US insisted that the OHR would not be closed until the conditions were fully met. At the same time, US believed that it would be necessary for BiH to ensure proper conditions, i.e. the constitutional reform, in order to function effectively after the closure of the OHR). With regard to basic ideas, the Butmir process should provide for harmonisation of the Constitution of BiH with the European Convention on Human Rights (at that time merely with regard to the opinion of the Venice Commission); composition, appointment and competence of the Presidency of BiH and the Council of Ministers of BiH should be changed; a number of representatives in both Houses should be increased; by implementing the so-called European clause it was desired to overcome/prevent abuses and blockades enabled through entity voting; with an agreement on the division of state and defence property the OHR transition should be started.

29. After several meetings in October and November 2009, the process "ended" in mid-December without success.

30. SDA, a still leading Bosniac party, demonstrated a higher degree of flexibility than the other Bosniac party, SBiH. The leading Serb party, SNSD, continued with the policy of strengthening the statehood of the Republika Srpska ~~and undermining BiH as a state (SERBIA)~~. A basis for the Croat parties was the requirement to exercise the role of the Croats in the state as provided by the Constitution. The opposition SDP held that international initiators of the process had yielded to the policy of the leading Serb party to the detriment of the country.

31. During the Butmir process, an unwritten rule was applied according to which HR/EUSR Inzko did not prejudice politics of BiH by applying the Bonn powers. As a consequence, the mandate of international judges and prosecutors competent for war crimes and the fight against

organised crime almost expired. One day prior to the expiry of their mandate, i.e. on 14 December 2009, Inzko applied the Bonn powers and thus extended the mandate of international judges until 2012.

32. In 2009, a discussion on the future status of BiH, particularly of the Republika Srpska, took place in the Republika Srpska, in particular among members of social networks. This discussion was a direct result of severe political discrepancies at the state level serving the leaders of the Republika Srpska as the basis according to which their actions had been the consequence of people's will. At the beginning of 2010, positions of the leaders of the Republika Srpska became even more firm: On 10 February 2010, the House of Representatives of the National Assembly of the Republika Srpska responded to the use of the Bonn powers applied in December and, **within the framework of DPA, (SERBIA)** adopted the Act on Referendum and People's Initiative lodged by the Government of the Republika Srpska enabling the calling of ~~two referendums, namely on secession and independence~~ (SERBIA), and the application of the Bonn powers by the OHR.

33. On 22 February 2010, the Bosniac club at the House of People of the National Assembly of the Republika Srpska used veto and demanded the examination before the Constitutional Court of the Republika Srpska which confirmed the Act on Referendum and People's Initiative. During the election campaign, the Act on Referendum was not a political theme. In terms of law, however, question pertaining to entire BiH are not to be decided by means of a referendum conducted in one entity only.

34. In discussions in Butmir, Čović (HDZ) pointed out several times that the formation of the Croat federal unit was a minimum for the Croats and that they would demand it in negotiations. Čović was supported also by Dodik (SNSD).

35. ~~Many controversies were caused by the question of Serbia's positions in the event of the possible declaration of independence of the Republika Srpska, in particular with regard to Kosovo's declaration of independence.~~ (SERBIA) Serbian President Tadić pointed out several times that Serbia would not interfere with internal affairs of BiH and would not support the separation of BiH.

VII. CASE "SEJDIĆ AND FINCI v. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA"

36. On 22 December 2009, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) passed a judgement in the "Sejdić and Finči" case concerning the discrimination of national minorities in their right to stand for elections. Dervo Sejdić and Jakob Finči are citizens of BiH, the former is of Roma origin and the latter is a Jew. They sued BiH for discrimination, since being of non-

constituent people they were not allowed to stand for elections, unless they would express themselves a Bosniac, Serb or Croat.

37. In February 2010, the working group for the preparation of amendments to the constitution (the state Ministries – of Justice – of civil Affairs – of Human Rights and Refugees) prepared the Action Plan to amend the BiH Constitution and the election law which foresaw the preparation of amendments by the end of March 2010. Due to different views of individual parties concerning the concept of the constitutional changes and due to the fact that the election campaign for the October general elections had already started informally, the amendments did not take place.

38. The Council of Europe did not set a deadline for the implementation of the judgement, passed by the ECHR, there are also no sanctions as regards the abolition of violations. It is of vital importance that efforts for the elimination of violations continue. On 29 April 2010, a resolution and recommendations concerning the implementation of the judgement of the ECHR were adopted, which emphasises the urgency to adjust the Constitution and the electoral legislation according to the judgement of the ECHR. The Council of Europe discussed again the "Sejdić and Finci" case at the June and December meeting of the Committee of Ministers' Deputies of the Council of Europe which just points to the violations of the defaulting states.

VIII. "BERLIN PROCESS"

39. In December 2010, German Chancellor Angela Merkel received leaders of main BiH political parties (HDZ – the Croatian Democratic Union, SDP – the Social Democratic Party, SDA – the Party of Democratic Action and SNSD – the Alliance of Independent Social Democrats) in Berlin for the first time. From the present point of view, these talks are considered as the first round of consultations on the constitutional reform. Furthermore, between 19 and 26 January 2011 Chancellor Merkel engaged herself once again and started the second round of negotiations by receiving Tihic and Izetbegović, Čović, Lagumdžij, Ljubić and Radojičić.

40. In addition, Chancellor Merkel received on 11 February 2011 in Berlin Dodik. At their meeting, the later expressed that the Republika Srpska could not accept the so-called European clause, according to which all decisions on European issues would be automatically transferred to the level of BiH, be integrated in the constitution. The European integration presents for the Republika Srpska an opportunity to strengthen its autonomy and stability, and not to lose it. If a path in the EU means a reduction in their competences, such path is unacceptable for them.

IX. FUTURE?

41. **Common elements of the parties** that obtained the highest number of votes in the elections and will probably form a new coalition at the state level (SDP, SDA, SNSD, SDS, HDZ, HDZ 1990) **with regard to the constitutional reform** are as follows:

- Constitutional changes are possible only on the basis of a consensus between both entities and all three constituent people in BiH.
- Constitutional changes should not change the principle of territorial integrity and sovereignty of the state BiH.
- Constitutional changes aim at the functional state BiH, thus facilitating and accelerating Euro-Atlantic integrations of BiH.
- Constitutional changes can only be introduced gradually and partially; the Dayton Constitution can only be modified. Changes will in the first place include the observance of the judgement of the European Court of Human Rights concerning the "Sejdić and Finci" case.
- It will not be possible to eliminate the entity arrangement. It would be possible, however, to modify Entities into regions and add two new regions (such as the Croat region and the region of the Sarajevo District) having a status of federal units (cantons) as basically provided by the Prud Agreement or the Kreševo Declaration.
- Entity voting should not be abolished; however, it could be modified by implementing the so-called European clause. This means that in certain cases, i.e. when essential European acts were adopted, veto in the House of Representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH would not be allowed.

42. All parties bear in mind that one of the major tasks of a new Government coalition will be the constitutional reform; however, among three coalition programme platforms for the formation of the coalition majority – the **Croat** one (HDZ, HDZ 1990), the **Serb** one (SNSD, SDS) and the **platform of four** for European BiH (SDP BiH, SDA, NSRzB and HSP) there exist substantial differences in the views regarding the future of the state BiH. The Croat platform advocates, in particular, constitutional changes and establishment of regions based on the principles of the Kreševo Declaration which would bring the establishment of one region with a relative Croat majority. The Serb platform advocates the strengthening of the Republika Srpska by recovering certain competences which were transferred from the Entity to the state and by prohibiting a transfer of new competences from the Entity to the state. The platform of four supports the strengthening of the state by enhancing the state powers of BiH while protecting nation's interests by taking into account the principle of the protection of collective rights.

43. Position of the **platform of four** for European BiH is in favour of implementing the "European clause". The **Serb platform** supports the preservation of the existing constitutional

competences of the Entities and even their expansion – according to their opinion, the "European clause" is not necessary for speeding up the European path of BiH at all. The **Croat platform** does not exercise specifically the "European clause" and allows for various possibilities.

XI. PAM involvement

44. In June 2009, PAM sent a high-level mission to Sarajevo ahead of the October 2010 parliamentary elections, in order to meet with the Office of the High Representative / European Union Special Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Presidency Collegium of the Parliamentary Assembly of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Mr. Sefik Dzaferovic, Chairman of the Constitutional-Law Committee of the House of Representatives of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The mission report was adopted in October 2010 by our Plenary Session in Rabat.

45. A number of follow-up discussions took place with the United Nations and the OSCE on how to cooperate at international/regional level in view of the difficulties for BiH to form a new government following the 3 October 2010 elections, a deadlock overcome in mid-May 2011. On the margins of the 65th Session of the United Nations General Assembly in September 2010, PAM Secretary General Dr. Piazzzi, held meetings with Under-Secretary-General (USG) for Political Affairs, Mr. B. Lynn Pascoe, USG for Peacekeeping Operations, Amb. Alain Le Roy, and USG for Humanitarian Affairs, Ms. Valerie Amos, as well as with Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Oscar Fernandez-Taranco. In October 2010, bilateral meetings were held, in Malta, with Amb. Marc Perrin de Brichambaut, Secretary General of the OSCE, as well as with Amb. Renatas Norkus, Chairperson of the Mediterranean Partners Contact Group of the OSCE, with Amb. François Alabrune, Permanent Representative of France to the OSCE, and with Hon. Riccardo Migliori, Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE. Both the United Nations and the OSCE expressed the will to hold a joint meeting under PAM auspices. Dr. Michael Frendo, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Malta, has expressed its wish to host such a meeting during the course of 2011.