



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEL/634/09
23 July 2009

ENGLISH only

Chairmanship: Greece

2009 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23 and 24 June 2009

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Decision No. 884 on the dates of the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference	1
Decision No. 894 on the agenda and organizational modalities of the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference (2009 ASRC)	3
Chairperson's perception on the outcome of the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference (2009 ASRC)	10
Opening session	14
Working session I: The OSCE'S approach to and activities in the area of early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation	22
Working session II: Politico-military aspects of security: arms control arrangements and confidence- and security-building measures in the OSCE area	28
Working session III: The OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative approach to preventing and combating terrorism and related threats	33
Closing session	37



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/884
5 March 2009

Original: ENGLISH

752nd Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 752, Agenda item 2

**DECISION No. 884
DATES OF THE 2009 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE**

The Permanent Council,

Taking into account the recommendation of the Forum for Security Co-operation,

Decides that the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference will take place in Vienna on 23 and 24 June 2009.

PC.DEC/884
5 March 2009
Attachment

Original: ENGLISH

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Turkey:

“Thank you, Madam Chairperson,

Turkey would like to make the following interpretative statement under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the OSCE Rules of Procedure:

Turkey has joined consensus on the decision concerning the dates of the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference on the expectation that if, among the participating States, an understanding emerges regarding the utility and necessity of convening the Conference at the Ministerial level, further consultations will be held in order to agree on suitable dates that would allow the participation of the largest number of Ministers in the Conference. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey may not be able to attend the Conference on the dates mentioned in the decision due to his programme.

I would like to request that this interpretative statement be attached to the journal of the day.

Thank you, Madam Chairperson.”



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/894
7 May 2009

Original: ENGLISH

760th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 760, Agenda item 1

**DECISION No. 894
AGENDA AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2009
ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (ASRC)**

The Permanent Council,

Recalling Porto Ministerial Council Decision No. 3, on the Annual Security Review Conference,

Taking into account its Decision No. 884 on the dates of the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference,

Taking into account the recommendation of the Forum for Security Co-operation,

Decides to organize the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference in accordance with the programme, agenda and organizational modalities contained in the annexes to this decision.

2009 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23 and 24 June 2009

Programme

Tuesday, 23 June 2009

- 10 a.m.–1 p.m. Opening session
- 3–6 p.m. Working session I: The OSCE's approach to and activities in the area of early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation

Wednesday, 24 June 2009

- 10 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session II: Politico-military aspects of security: Arms control arrangements and confidence- and security-building measures in the OSCE area
- 3–5.45 p.m. Working session III: The OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative approach to preventing and combating terrorism and related threats
- 5.45–6.15 p.m. Closing session

Agenda

Opening session (23 June 2009, 10 a.m.–1 p.m.):

Under the overall theme of Co-operative Security: Concept and Commitment — Achievements, Challenges and Prospects, the opening session will set the stage for the Conference by discussing how participating States have worked together to address common security issues, as well as to generate new ideas for enhancing co-operative and comprehensive security. In this context, the opening session could focus on those proposals brought forth recently by some of the OSCE participating States referring to further enhancing European security. The opening session serves to build an intellectual bridge connecting the ideas of the early years of the CSCE/OSCE with current ideas regarding European security arrangements, providing an opportunity to participants to share their views in a wide and comprehensive forum. Moreover, building on relevant OSCE documents, the session will address the need for synergy in promoting co-operative, indivisible and cross-dimensional security. It would also serve as a link between non-military and politico-military aspects of security.

Working session I: The OSCE's approach to and activities in the area of early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation
(23 June 2009, 3–6 p.m.):

Working session I highlights the importance of addressing and settling the protracted conflicts on the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and all other agreed OSCE norms and principles. It will review the OSCE activities related to crisis situations, *inter alia*, armed conflicts, and their impact on peace, stability and security in the OSCE area, with special focus on developments since the 2008 ASRC, including in August 2008. In this regard, it will examine the relevant work of the field operations as well as which tools, instruments and procedures were used, including Chapter III of the Vienna Document 1999 and what can possibly be learned from these experiences. Moreover, the session will reflect on whether the OSCE toolbox needs further improvement/updating. Since the OSCE approach to early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation is an integral part of discussions on European security, this session will benefit directly from the deliberations in the opening session.

Working session II: Politico-military aspects of security: Arms control arrangements and confidence- and security-building measures in the OSCE area
(24 June 2009, 10 a.m.–1 p.m.):

With reference to paragraph 1 of MC.DEC/13/08 on issues relevant to the Forum for Security Co-operation, the session will focus on efforts in the field of arms control agreements and confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs). Participants will have the opportunity to review the state of play of existing arms control arrangements, with special focus on the CFE regime, as well as the CSBMs and possible ways for their further improvement, including better use of regional and subregional CSBMs.

Working session III: The OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative approach to preventing and combating terrorism and related threats (24 June 2009, 3–5.45 p.m.):

This session will provide an opportunity to explore possibilities for realizing the OSCE's concept of comprehensive security in combating terrorism, *inter alia* through discussing OSCE activities referred to in MC.DEC/10/08. Participants will review implementation of existing OSCE commitments in combating terrorism, as mandated by MC(10).DEC/3. Participants could reflect on the Secretary General's report submitted to participating States on 1 April 2009, as stipulated in MC.DEC/10/08. Security challenges and threats linked to terrorist activities, such as the smuggling of arms and narcotics and trafficking in human beings may also be considered. Other topics that could be addressed, especially from a regional perspective and with the combating of terrorism as the common denominator, are border security and management and cross border co-operation. Moreover, the session can be used as a forum to exchange views on progress made in implementing UNSCR 1540 in respect of its relevance to counter-terrorism work in the OSCE.

Closing session (24 June 2009, 5.45–6.15 p.m.):

In the closing session, the Chairperson will present a first perception of the results of the working groups, as well as recommendations made at the Conference on ways to follow up on them, in order to enhance the security dialogue.

ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2009 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23 and 24 June 2009

Background

The Tenth Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council, at Porto, by adopting its Decision No. 3, dated 7 December 2002, established the Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC) to provide a framework for enhancing security dialogue and for reviewing security work undertaken by the OSCE and its participating States, to provide an opportunity to exchange views on issues related to arms control and confidence- and security-building measures, and to promote the exchange of information and co-operation with relevant international and regional organizations and institutions.

Organization

A representative of the Chairperson-in-Office will chair the opening and closing sessions. The Secretariat will issue a journal of the Conference.

Each working session will have one moderator and at least one rapporteur. The Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) will serve as co-ordinator for preparing the session.

The FSC contribution to the ASRC includes the chairing of the second working session by a member of the FSC Troika or the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC).

The Rules of Procedure of the OSCE will be followed, *mutatis mutandis*, at the Conference. Also, the guidelines for organizing OSCE meetings (Permanent Council Decision No. 762) will be taken into account.

Interpretation from and into all six working languages of the OSCE will be provided at the opening, working and closing sessions.

The Chairmanship will co-ordinate the preparation of the ASRC with the FSC Chairperson and the OSCE Secretariat.

The Chairperson-in-Office will distribute a comprehensive report on the Conference before the summer recess.

The Press and Public Information Section (PPIS) will inform the press, as appropriate.

Participation

The participating States are encouraged to be represented at a high level, by senior officials from capitals, responsible for security-related policy in the OSCE area.

The OSCE institutions will participate in the Conference, as will the Secretary General and the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC). The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and the Partners for Co-operation will be invited to participate.

The Chairmanship may also invite some heads of OSCE field operations to participate in the Conference. Consideration should be given to the possibility of inviting heads of field operations to be present as keynote speakers or moderators.

The international organizations that may be invited are the security-related organizations mentioned in Permanent Council Decision No. 862, of 16 October 2008.

Consideration is to be given to the possibility of inviting security-related scientific institutes, think-tanks of international standing, and NGOs to send keynote speakers or to be represented as members of national delegations.

General guidelines for participants

The work of the ASRC will be conducted in five sessions. The opening session is intended to provide an opportunity for formal statements to be delivered and to set the stage for substantive, focused and interactive discussions at the working sessions. The opening session will include the welcoming remarks by the Chairperson-in-Office or her representative and the report by the FSC Chairperson. The Chairmanship will explore the possibility of inviting high-level special guest(s) to address the Conference.

The working sessions will concentrate on one topic, introduced by one or two keynote speakers, whose addresses may be followed by a discussion of relevant subtopics that are mentioned in the agenda.

The aim is an interactive and free-flowing discussion.

In order to reinforce the effectiveness of security activities across all three dimensions of the OSCE, it is expected that, at each of the sessions, the interfaces of security, and also the question of co-operation with other international organizations, will be addressed.

To promote interactive discussion, the formal statements at the opening session and the interventions at the working sessions should be as concise as possible and should not exceed five minutes in length. Prior circulation of statements and interventions will enhance the possibility for engaging in discussion.

By 9 June 2009, the participants in the Conference should inform the OSCE Secretariat of the composition of their delegations to the ASRC, in response to the information circular regarding organizational aspects of the Conference which will be sent out by the OSCE Secretariat.

By 15 June 2009, the participating States and other participants in the Conference are invited to submit any written contributions they may have, including those that contain reactions to the keynote speeches.

Written contributions should be submitted to the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), which will then distribute them. The information could also include contributions from OSCE institutions and other international organizations, if appropriate.

Guidelines for keynote speakers

The contributions of the keynote speakers should be focused on the subject of the relevant session, thus setting the scene for the discussion at the sessions, and should stimulate debate among delegations by raising appropriate questions and suggesting potential recommendations based on OSCE realities.

The maximum available speaking time is 20–25 minutes per keynote speaker.

Keynote speakers should be present during the entire session at which they are speaking, and should be ready to engage in the debate following their presentation.

To enable delegations to prepare themselves, keynote speakers should provide a written contribution and their biographical synopsis to the CPC by 6 June 2009. In their presentations, keynote speakers should touch on the highlights of their written contribution.

Guidelines for moderators and rapporteurs

The moderator chairs the session and should facilitate and focus the dialogue among delegations. The moderator should stimulate the debate by introducing items related to the subject of the opening and working sessions, as appropriate, in order to broaden or focus the scope of the discussion.

The rapporteurs' written reports should address issues raised during the relevant sessions, and should cover problem areas, improvements, suggestions made at the session, and other relevant information.

Personal views shall not be advanced.

Guidelines for the participation of other international organizations

International organizations may participate in all the sessions. They are invited to concentrate their contributions on aspects of co-operation with the OSCE within the scope of the relevant session.

International organizations should provide factual information, useful for the participants of the ASRC, to the CPC by 6 June 2009.

2009 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE CHAIRPERSON'S PERCEPTION

The seventh Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC) took place against the background of serious challenges to European security coupled with important proposals that create new opportunities for European security dialogue. All participating States agreed that in view of significant events since the previous ASRC in 2008 there was an urgent need for a profound and open dialogue if the challenges were to be overcome and maximum use made of the opportunities available. The overall theme of the Conference "Co-operative security: Concept and Commitment – Achievements, Challenges, Prospects" proved to be the right focus as it allowed for a discussion of major security concerns, thus paving the way for a structured and focused debate at the informal ministerial meeting on Corfu and beyond. It also demonstrated the pressing need for a thorough debate on the basics of European security, based on the concepts of co-operative and comprehensive security and involving all the OSCE participating States.

In this regard, the work of the 2009 ASRC benefited greatly from the address of its high-level guest, H.E. Mr. Sergei Lavrov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, who presented his country's vision for the future of European security. The Chairmanship has taken note of Mr. Lavrov's presentation, in particular of the ideas for a treaty on European security and for such a treaty's basic structure. One point of particular interest echoing a principle at the heart of the OSCE process was that, in order to create a viable system of security in Europe, the interests of all its participants had to be taken into consideration.

We also take note of Mr. Lavrov's argument regarding the importance of the concept of indivisible security and that it should form the basis of a new security system in Europe. Another valuable idea is that the OSCE has the potential, particularly if its structure is strengthened, to play a key role in promoting dialogue on issues related to pan-European security. In this connection, Minister Lavrov suggested that the basic principles and commitments of the Organization should become legally binding.

Furthermore, he argued in favour of increased interaction amongst key international and regional organizations, on the basis of the OSCE Platform for Co-operative Security.

In the lively debate that followed Mr. Lavrov's presentation, participating States presented their views concerning the dialogue on European security. A broad convergence of opinions was noticed in the following points:

- The OSCE should remain the key forum for discussions on the future of European security, on account of its wide geographic span, its comprehensive concept of security including all three dimensions, and the fact that all OSCE participating States have equal status. However, other forums may complement our work;
- Restoration of confidence and trust should be the first priority in future discussions on European security. Promoting the peaceful resolution of protracted conflicts and revitalizing arms control and CSBMs in Europe are of the utmost importance in this context;

- Furthermore, we need to work on ways to make full use of the potential of existing OSCE instruments and mechanisms, and to consider whether the development of new tools would be beneficial;
- The fundamental principles of the OSCE, enshrined in particular in the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris and the Charter for European Security, including the Platform for Co-operative Security, remain the irreplaceable basis of comprehensive and co-operative security and for structured dialogue on that subject. Implementation, by all and in good faith, of the commitments undertaken in this framework remains crucial for successfully addressing traditional threats and risks and challenges stemming from outside the OSCE area, including those originating in Afghanistan.

The discussion during the working sessions benefited greatly from very thoughtful and thorough presentations by keynote speakers.

The discussions in working session I, “The OSCE’s approach to and activities in the area of early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation”, took place against the backdrop of the August 2008 armed conflict in Georgia, which had shown the serious implications that protracted conflicts may have for overall security in the OSCE area. The discussion benefited from the presentations of two keynote speakers, which focused on the geo-strategic and historic background of protracted conflicts and the work of the OSCE field operations in conflict areas.

The debate made it clear that the OSCE capacity in the areas of early warning and conflict prevention and resolution must be enhanced on the basis of agreed principles (even legally binding principles, according to one proposal), and that more thought needed to be given to how to muster the political will necessary for the OSCE to be able engage effectively in these areas.

However, it was stressed that OSCE institutions and field operations remained instrumental for purposes of early warning, conflict prevention, and conflict resolution, as they had the capacity to address all phases of a conflict cycle.

An assessment of existing OSCE mechanisms needed to be made, with specific focus on those of a preventive nature. In the framework of this assessment an updating of existing mechanisms could be useful.

In view of occasional instances of lack of political will causing difficulties in the activation of OSCE mechanisms, it was pointed out that it would be advisable to develop the development of non-consensual procedures in the area of preventive action and crisis management.

In working session II, “Politico-military aspects of security: Arms control arrangements and confidence- and security-building measures in the OSCE area”, it was noted that arms control, disarmament and confidence-building constituted the key to an integrated security policy in the Euro-Atlantic area. The discussion benefited from the presentations of two keynote speakers. One speaker presented the historic background of the CFE Treaty in relation to the evolution of the concept of co-operative security, underlining the renewed need for taking into consideration the interests of all signatories when pursuing a solution to the crisis. The other speaker, following on from the recent (10 June 2009) Berlin

seminar, put the focus on the relevance of the arms control regime to the whole OSCE community, highlighting possible ways ahead that take into account, *inter alia*, developments in military technology and management.

In the ensuing discussion, it was generally agreed that while the CFE regime, the Open Skies Treaty and the Vienna Document 1999 were of particular importance to European security, their effectiveness needed to be improved. It was further stressed that existing institutions should not be dismantled and security agreements and arrangements already in force not abandoned. In this context, it was underlined that the basic and essential concepts of the CSCE and OSCE must be preserved in their entirety.

Various speakers stressed that the CFE Treaty had a central position in European security and that ways to overcome the current crisis should be explored. In this respect, it was noted that intensified negotiations on the “parallel actions package” would be the main way forward.

The possibility of convening another special FSC meeting on the future of European arms control as a follow-up to the Berlin seminar on 10 June 2009 was suggested. Moreover, it was proposed that a draft Ministerial Council decision on the future activities of the FSC be elaborated, with special focus on arms control.

It was underlined that the OSCE needed to find efficient ways to address new threats to security. In this regard, the link between combating terrorism and non-proliferation was highlighted and calls were voiced for the OSCE to build on its strengths and increase its involvement in this area.

Working session III, “The OSCE’s comprehensive and co-operative approach to preventing and combating terrorism and related threats”, started by identifying terrorism as one of the most serious threats to European security, especially considering the increase in prominence of modern communication technologies. Greater co-operation between the relevant international organizations was necessary in order to combat this threat more efficiently. The discussion benefited from the presentations of two keynote speakers. One speaker talked on the actual and potential links between OSCE work and the UN initiatives to counter terrorism, while the other speaker highlighted the causes and broader characteristics of terrorism, also considering trends in the phenomenon itself.

In the ensuing debate, delegations gave recognition to the following points:

- It is as important as ever to identify cutting-edge fields in which the OSCE can provide added value.
- The fundamental elements of the fight against terrorism must take account of its root causes, including their political, economical and social aspects. Efforts to combat terrorism should respect international law, the rule of law, and human rights.
- New threats present challenges in all three dimensions. As mentioned by many delegations, the OSCE should be strengthened in order to contribute effectively to the fight against these new threats.

In conclusion, the Chairmanship regards the ASRC as having been a successful one and greatly appreciates the assistance provided by the Conflict Prevention Centre and Conference Services as well as the other actors in the Secretariat that prepared the ground for fruitful and focused discussions. The Chairmanship believes that the proposals put forward during the ASRC are compatible. While they indicate the different priorities of the participating States, they testify to the existence of many common elements on which we can further build up the dialogue among the participating States. The Chairmanship will consider ways to follow up on certain recommendations made, but also strongly encourages participating States to bring forward the recommendations and suggestions that they consider relevant for further discussion in the OSCE framework.

The common ground that emerged during the 2009 ASRC greatly enhances the perspective for carrying out a cross-dimensional and co-operative process during the informal ministerial meeting in Corfu.

OPENING SESSION

- Chair: Ambassador Mara Marinaki, Chairperson of the Permanent Council
- Report: Ambassador Paata Gaprindashvili, Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation
- High-level guest: H.E. Mr. Sergei Lavrov, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Russian Federation
- Rapporteur: José Antonio Sabadell, Permanent Mission of Spain to the OSCE

The purpose of the opening session was to set the stage for the Conference by discussing how participating States have worked together to address common security issues, and to generate new ideas for enhancing co-operative and comprehensive security.

The opening remarks by the Chairperson of the Permanent Council concentrated on the concept of co-operative security, which rests on the underlying premise that security is indivisible. Moreover, Ambassador Marinaki noted that the OSCE had built a unique security architecture in Europe, which provided a framework for co-operative security linking the military and politico-military aspects.

The Chairperson of the Permanent Council considered developments that had taken place since the previous ASRC and constitute serious challenges for security in the OSCE area. In particular she noted the developments in Georgia, including the armed confrontation that took place in August 2008, and the lack of progress in solving the crisis over the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty).

On a positive note, she welcomed the start of the debate concerning the future of European security and considered that the opening session presented an excellent opportunity to reflect on existing proposals. She added that the informal ministerial meeting in Corfu might set out a clear strategy on the way forward.

The Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation presented the Conference with his report on the Forum's activities. He noted that the situation in the South Caucasus had been the main focus of attention for the OSCE in its attempts to defuse tensions, then to negotiate a ceasefire and contribute to monitoring efforts, and finally to preserve the international presence on the ground. Ambassador Gaprindashvili noted that the overwhelming majority of OSCE delegations regretted the closing of the OSCE Mission to Georgia and the UN Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG).

In his report, Ambassador Gaprindashvili underlined the fact that the FSC had paid close attention to the debate on the future of European security, notably in a joint FSC/PC meeting on 18 February. He stated that concrete actions were needed if a genuine collective security system was to be formed and that efforts should continue to be made to effect lasting solutions to unresolved conflicts, to revitalize the CFE Treaty, and to look at the effectiveness of current implementation of commitments.

The report listed several other matters that were dealt with by the FSC during the last twelve months, including confidence- and security-building measures, small arms and light weapons, Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, implementation of UNSCR 1540, and new security threats and challenges, including cyber security.

H.E. Mr. Sergei Lavrov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, delivered his statement as the high-level guest of the Conference. Minister Lavrov noted that, in order to address the current risks and challenges to security, the international community would need to deal with the systemic shortcomings of the current system of European security. He considered the main problem in this respect to be the lack of guarantees of compliance with the principle of the indivisibility of security.

Although at the theoretical level all supported the principle of the indivisibility of security, “the devil”, Minister Lavrov said, was “in the details.” He furthermore noted that the problem of different approaches to security could be easily solved if the OSCE were to be institutionalized and become a fully-fledged regional organization under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. This would allow the Organization to deal with the whole spectrum of security-related issues in Europe on the basis of legally binding commitments.

Minister Lavrov expressed the opinion that one way to strengthen current commitments would be to convert them into legal instruments and to create mechanisms promoting their implementation not only by States but also by international organizations. He furthermore contended that a second systematic problem was the disconnection between the global character of the existing risks (inter-State, intra-State and non-State) and the narrow approach that is being taken to addressing them.

There were numerous subregional organizations in the OSCE area, Minister Lavrov pointed out, but also a great deal of overlap of activities and insufficient co-ordination. At times, there was even competition amongst these organizations. Although the Platform for Co-operative Security was meant to address this problem, it was not being used to its full potential and there was a need to turn it into an efficient tool.

Minister Lavrov noted with regret that in relations between countries and organizations there was frequently a lack of constancy in or commitment to the priorities agreed upon; for example, the approach of countries to the CFE Treaty ranged from full support to lack of interest. He also stated that the situation with regard to confidence-building measures was becoming increasingly stagnant: only around half of the provisions of the Vienna Document were being applied, and of this half not all were being implemented in good faith.

As another example of “inconstancy of political priorities and double standards”, Minister Lavrov noted the approaches taken to conflict resolution, as evidenced by differing views of participating States regarding the recognition of the independence of specific territories. He stressed that, in order to create a sustainable security system, it was necessary to take into account the interests of all the participants in that system.

Minister Lavrov outlined four major building blocks for a possible treaty on European security:

- Basic principles of relations between States;

- Basic principles for arms control regimes, confidence-building, restraint and reasonable sufficiency in military doctrine;
- Basic principles for conflict resolution;
- Mechanisms for co-operation between States and organizations on countering new threats and challenges.

According to Minister Lavrov, the Russian proposals were not directed against NATO or any other international organization. He reminded his listeners that what the Russian Federation had proposed was a meeting of the leaders of the OSCE, NATO, the EU, the CIS, and the CSTO based on the principles of the OSCE Platform for Co-operative Security. Such a meeting would be a step towards establishing common approaches to the indivisible and common security space in the Euro-Atlantic area.

Minister Lavrov expressed satisfaction at the fact that the Russian initiative for a discussion on European security had revived the interest of the international community in the OSCE and expressed the hope that this would promote the process of OSCE reform.

In closing, Minister Lavrov stated that if the present Russian initiative were not to be implemented, there would be a risk of full-scale “renationalization” – or “privatization” – of politico-military security, with all the related consequences.

Discussion

Following the opening statements, 15 delegations took the floor.

The first delegation to intervene, speaking also on behalf of a group of States, stressed that their ideas on the main principles concerning the debate on the future of European security remained unchanged and that they would continue to engage in the debate constructively. The informal ministerial meeting in Corfu would provide the opportunity for an open and thorough discussion of the topic.

Turning to the subject of protracted conflicts, the delegation focused on the situation in Georgia, reiterating its support for the country’s sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders. The delegation also expressed concern regarding the signing of agreements between the Russian Federation and the authorities of the Georgian separatist regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia on the joint protection of the so-called borders. Moreover, the delegation expressed concern at the announced build-up of Russian military presence in these regions and regretted the discontinuation of OSCE and UN presences on the ground. The delegation also expressed support for the work undertaken by the OSCE Minsk Group aimed at resolving the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. It also called for the resumption of negotiations in the “5+2” format to work on the settlement of the Transdnistrian conflict.

The delegation also welcomed attempts to overcome the current deadlock in the discussions on the CFE Treaty and called on the Russian Federation to immediately resume application of the Treaty and to work with the States concerned to achieve an agreement on the basis of the “parallel actions package”.

Finally, the delegation underlined the importance of OSCE activities in the areas of small arms and light weapons, confidence- and security-building measures, cyber security, counter-terrorism and border management.

The second delegation to take the floor expressed the opinion that although the OSCE commitments adequately addressed the current challenges to security, there was still room for improvement. It noted that a number of new threats had arisen in the OSCE area, notably the violent conflict between two OSCE participating States in 2008, terrorism, the emergence of “black hole” territories, the radicalization of non-State actors, and issues related to energy security. The delegation argued that the so-called “failure” of the current security system was first and foremost the fault of one participating State, which had unilaterally decided to establish new rules of conduct in the international arena. The delegation noted that no participating State should entertain the illusion that a new security framework would provide a chance to maintain an illegal military presence in a neighbouring country or allow interference over the sovereign right of any State to choose its allies. The key to strengthening European security must be the unequivocal adherence to commitments already undertaken.

The same delegation also addressed several questions to the special guest, the subjects including the principles of sovereignty and inviolability of territorial integrity, and the future of the European security architecture.

The third delegation emphasized the need for a debate on the future of security in Europe that would take into account the situation in Georgia and the erosion of the CFE regime. The debate should be based on the following ideas: the reaffirmation of the main principles of European security; the comprehensive concept of security; the re-launching of conventional arms control; co-operation on activities and measures against terrorism and proliferation; co-operation on crisis management; and co-operation in the areas of energy security and environmental security.

The delegation furthermore noted that the OSCE was the natural forum for a discussion on European security.

The fourth delegation to take the floor shared the view expressed by others that the security situation in the OSCE area left room for improvement and that a collective approach was needed to achieve this, including co-operation on a legally binding security treaty.

The delegation maintained that the discussion on the future of European security should take place in the framework of the OSCE and that the dialogue should be pragmatic and aimed at preventing the eruption of conflicts. It stressed that politico-military issues were an important part of such a discussion and that the informal ministerial meeting in Corfu should indicate the way forward to Athens and beyond.

The fifth delegation noted that although the OSCE had agreed on important commitments, it now faced new threats, including the rise of violent extremism, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, overdependence on fossil fuels, poverty, corruption, disease, cyber crime, narco-terrorism and increasing competition for limited resources.

The delegation maintained that there was a need to strengthen the institutional capacity of the OSCE to address not only traditional but also new threats, some of which have their roots outside the OSCE area. It noted that the OSCE was the key multilateral venue for the dialogue on strengthening Euro-Atlantic security, although other forums might complement these efforts. The delegation also stressed that the dialogue must aim at restoring confidence and should be based on existing principles and values as well as on existing institutions and agreements.

The sixth delegation to take the floor regretted that the OSCE had not been able to prevent the armed conflict that broke out in its area in August last year. The delegation also noted with regret that it had not been possible to achieve a consensus on maintaining an OSCE presence in Georgia. It observed that recent developments had made it clear that arms control agreements must remain a priority for the OSCE.

The delegation further welcomed the discussion on the future of European security, stating that the OSCE was the appropriate political platform for such a discussion and that the informal ministerial meeting in Corfu would provide an opportunity to bring about convergence amongst the various opinions on this issue.

The seventh delegation pointed out that the ASRC addressed only the first dimension of security, and that other dimensions had their own milestone events. The *acquis* of the OSCE was broad and impressive, with arms control mechanisms lying at its core. Unfortunately, the current situation surrounding the CFE Treaty and the Vienna Document 1999 had resulted in a severe shortage of mutual trust and confidence. In this context, the discussion on the future of European security was of vital importance.

The eighth delegation stated that the OSCE should adapt itself to the new security environment, in which a significant increase in a variety of threats, the exacerbation of old problems, and the emergence of new ones had brought about a need for a radical improvement of multilateral structures and a greater common understanding of international norms, treaties and agreements.

The delegation also stressed the need to focus on security problems in the region of Central Asia, with particular attention to measures to combat new threats and challenges to security, assistance to Afghanistan, and the strengthening of border security.

The ninth delegation expressed its support for a frank and open dialogue aimed at reaching a consensus in the discussions on the future of security in Europe, and considered that the informal ministerial meeting in Corfu would be an opportunity to define the road map to the Athens Ministerial Council meeting and beyond.

The tenth delegation to take the floor affirmed that the previous year had witnessed a measure of erosion in confidence and trust in the region that made the OSCE more needed than ever.

The delegation was ready to discuss proposals for new European security architecture in a frank and open manner and considered that the comprehensive approach to security and existing mechanisms had to be the basis for such a debate. Furthermore, the delegation noted that the situation in Afghanistan had an impact on the overall security within the OSCE area.

Moreover, the delegation expressed concern at the situation surrounding the CFE Treaty, and affirmed that the “parallel actions package” would be a possible way out of the current crisis.

The eleventh delegation emphasized that while the OSCE had played a crucial role in European security after the Cold War, gaps and failures had to be identified if the Organization was to be revitalized and made flexible and relevant to the new realities. It stressed that the Organization’s experience in conflict management was particularly needed.

The delegation noted that indivisible and comprehensive security had to be part of the debate on the future of European security.

The twelfth delegation pointed out that the OSCE should maintain a balance in its activities, including the fight against terrorism, drugs and illegal migration. Central Asia was a key element for the security of Europe, and the situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan must be addressed in a comprehensive manner. It stressed that the OSCE could play an important role in this context.

The European security system must take into account the special situation of countries with recent changes.

The thirteenth delegation considered that the OSCE had developed an impressive set of mutually reinforcing commitments, institutional arrangements and mechanisms. It stressed, however, that the participating States should exploit the full potential of the OSCE tools available.

The discussion on the future of European security must be based on the comprehensive concept of security and focus on the full implementation of existing commitments, the resolution of protracted conflicts, and the revitalization of the arms control regime and CSBMs.

Finally, the delegation expressed its disappointment at the closure of the OSCE and UN missions in Georgia, and considered that these steps represented serious setbacks for the resolution of the conflicts in certain regions of that country.

The fourteenth delegation, speaking on behalf of a group of States, brought to the attention of other delegations the Joint Declaration of the heads of state of the Organization for democracy and economic development – GUAM on the issue of conflict settlement; it considered that these principles could serve as a universal approach contributing to pan-European security.

The last delegation informed participants about its experience of establishing nuclear weapons-free zones on the Asian continent and collaborating with Afghanistan.

Recommendations and suggestions

Several of the statements and interventions delivered in the session included recommendations and suggestions for further work.

In the statement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the following recommendations and suggestions could be identified:

- The concept of indivisible security should be at the basis of a new security system in Europe, but a common agreement needs to be reached on the details of this concept.
- The OSCE could play a key role in addressing systemic shortcomings in our current European security framework, provided that it becomes a fully fledged regional organization under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter (continuing the OSCE reform).
- In order to strengthen the basic principles and commitments related to European security, it will be necessary to transform them into legal instruments.
- Furthermore, there is a need to take stock of the commitments on politico-military and non-military aspects of security and for their implementation to be subjected to regular review.
- The OSCE Platform for Co-operative Security should become operational and its potential be used more efficiently to reinforce co-operation between different international organizations.
- In 2010, a meeting of chairpersons of key security-related international and regional organizations (OSCE, NATO, CSTO, EU and CIS) should be held under the aegis of the OSCE in order to examine the security strategies and co-ordinate positions, with a view to contributing to the formation of an indivisible security space.
- To create a sustainable security system, it is necessary to take into account the interests of all its participants.
- A treaty on European security could include the following building blocks:
 - Basic principles of relations between States;
 - Basic principles for arms control regimes, confidence-building, restraint and reasonable sufficiency in military doctrine;
 - Basic principles for conflict resolution;
 - Arrangements for co-operation between States and organizations on countering new threats and challenges.

In the context of the discussion that followed on this statement, the following recommendations and suggestions were put forward:

- The OSCE should remain the key forum for discussions on the future of European security. Other forums may also contribute to this endeavour.
- The OSCE should be strengthened to face new threats, including terrorism and proliferation.
- The restoration of confidence and trust should be the first priority in future discussions on European security.

- The resolution of protracted conflicts must play a key role in developing the European security framework.
- European security should build on the present *acquis*, including the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris and the Charter for European Security — there is no need to rewrite existing commitments.
- The concept of indivisible security should be at the basis of discussions on European security.
- The informal ministerial meeting in Corfu should yield practical results on the way forward for the discussion on European security and set out a strategy to the Athens Ministerial Council meeting and beyond.
- The concept of security must remain comprehensive, thus including all three dimensions of security on an equal footing.
- The OSCE should make better use of existing OSCE instruments and mechanisms and consider whether the development of new tools would be beneficial.
- Stability in Afghanistan is a key component for security in the OSCE area. In order to achieve stability in this country, a comprehensive approach is necessary.
- The CFE Treaty and the CSBM regime should be reinvigorated to increase security and stability in the OSCE area. The “parallel actions package” is the most promising avenue for overcoming the crisis related to the CFE Treaty.

WORKING SESSION I: THE OSCE'S APPROACH TO AND ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA OF EARLY WARNING, CONFLICT PREVENTION AND RESOLUTION, CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND POST-CONFLICT REHABILITATION

Keynote speakers: Ambassador Rolf Ekéus, Chairman, Stockholm International
Peace Research Institute Governing Board, former OSCE High
Commissioner on National Minorities

Ambassador Roy Reeve, Deputy Head, EULEX Mission in
Kosovo

Moderator: Ambassador Herbert Salber, Director, Conflict Prevention
Centre

Rapporteur: Jan Kantorczyk, Permanent Mission of Germany to the OSCE

In his introductory remarks, the moderator, Ambassador Herbert Salber, welcomed the fact that the issues to be addressed in the session had remained in the OSCE's focus during the previous few years. At the same time, it had to be acknowledged that neither the activation of OSCE mechanisms and procedures, nor discussions during the previous year's ASRC, nor political dialogue during the many meetings of the FSC/PC had been able to prevent the outbreak of an armed conflict between two OSCE participating States in 2008. The moderator therefore suggested that participating States should consider how better to take the step from early warning to preventive action or appropriate crisis response mechanisms. Finally, Ambassador Salber drew attention to the 2008 Compendium of OSCE Mechanisms and Procedures (SEC.GAL/121/08) and to the 2009 OSCE Concept of Comprehensive and Co-operative Security (SEC.GAL/100/09) with its compilation of documents on the evolution and consolidation of the OSCE approach, noting that these were appropriate reference documents for a forward-looking approach.

The first keynote speaker, Ambassador Rolf Ekéus, started his presentation by giving a historical overview of Europe's security structures. He stated that NATO, not the OSCE, had become the structural base for the present security order. According to Ambassador Ekéus, it was against this background that President Medvedev had proposed an initiative aimed at searching for an all-encompassing institutional approach for a European co-operative security structure. The OSCE as an institution with highly important and structured capabilities could use this initiative in order to vitalize itself and create a foundation for the missing strategic dialogue between Russia and the West. This dialogue should aim at developing a joint grand strategy for Europe by, for example:

- Elaborating an OSCE-wide approach to energy security;
- Exploring the possibilities for and potential of integrating Russia's economy into the European economy; and

- Using the OSCE's organizational tools for military co-operation with Russia (supporting the reformation of Russian military forces to make them fit for possible joint operations under UN Security Council or OSCE mandates; joint military exercises; gradually integrating Russian peacekeeping and crisis management forces into corresponding European forces).

The end of the suspension of the implementation of the CFE Treaty and a revisiting of the Vienna Document were mentioned as central elements for a future European security order.

With regard to conflicts, Ambassador Ekéus stated that contemporary conflicts, including those in the OSCE area, were geographically limited and driven by regional or even local forces. At the same time, as had been demonstrated by the armed conflict in Georgia in 2008, regional conflicts could have wider political and security repercussions. International efforts aimed at preventing regional conflicts should be focused on addressing inter-ethnic problems and majority/minority relations. He noted that the long-term structural prevention of conflicts depended on many factors, including economic stability, inter-ethnic integration, and respect for the rule of law and human rights. In comparison with other international organizations, the OSCE was uniquely placed to assist in conflict prevention. In this context special emphasis was placed on the work of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM). Ambassador Ekéus finally stated that President Medvedev's proposal on European security was in conformity with the OSCE and its potential and that now was the time to come to the right conclusions.

The second keynote speaker, Ambassador Roy Reeve, spoke about the role of OSCE field operations with regard to early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. The OSCE's physical presence on the ground, with activities in all three dimensions, allowed it to play a key role in identifying potential conflict situations and contribute to the resolution of conflicts. In order for this role not be limited, Ambassador Reeve noted, it was essential for OSCE field operations to enjoy, among other things:

- A flexible, non-restrictive mandate;
- Constructive relations with host authorities;
- Adequately trained personnel;
- The will of participating States and the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) to provide rapid reaction and guidance to signals received from the field.

Among other factors relevant for OSCE field operations, Ambassador Reeve mentioned the need for a military component, not just in the mission but also in the Secretariat, to provide senior management with guidance on how to operate in violent conflict situations. Moreover, he argued that the non-career nature of the OSCE could hamper the continuity of the work of field operations. He also reflected on the emergence of other players in areas where the OSCE was operating, particularly the EU ESDP (European Security and Defence Policy) missions.

Discussion

The most significant element in the background to the discussion was the August 2008 armed conflict in Georgia, which had demonstrated the serious security implications that protracted conflicts may have for the overall security in the OSCE area. A total of 14 delegations and other speakers made contributions.

The first delegation to take the floor proposed a fundamental starting point for the discussion, namely, that the existing security system in Europe had performed its functions well and should not be undermined. The OSCE continued to have great potential to remain important, both as a forum for dialogue and as a provider of mechanisms for solving crises and moving the agenda forward in all three dimensions. The August war in Georgia had demonstrated that although OSCE mechanisms and procedures were still highly relevant, their usefulness depended on the political will of the parties. In comparison with other organizations, the OSCE had added value by virtue of its inclusive membership, its broad and comprehensive concept of security, and its extensive field presence and specialized institutions.

The delegation then reflected on the importance of close co-operation between the European Union and the OSCE, mentioning three issues that would presumably be high on the OSCE's agenda during the next six months: the future of European security, the situation in Georgia and other protracted conflicts, and matters related to the human dimension. On the subject of arms control, the hope was voiced that the stalemate regarding the ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty could be overcome, allowing for accession by new countries. Concerning the Vienna Document, the delegation expressed its willingness to discuss proposals aimed at better implementation and at expanding the scope of the Document, although at present it seemed difficult to reach consensus on the latter issue.

The next delegation started by regretting that the OSCE had failed to prevent the armed conflict in Georgia and that it had been impossible to extend the OSCE Mission to Georgia and the United Nations Observer Mission in that country. The armed conflict had shown that early warning and conflict resolution can only function if all the parties involved display the necessary political will. An appeal was made to the parties to work constructively towards maintaining a role for the OSCE in all of Georgia. The delegation furthermore stated that the trust that had been lost must be regained, not only in Georgia, but also in other protracted conflicts. These and other important questions such as securing the CFE regime had to be discussed openly at the informal meeting of the OSCE foreign ministers in Corfu. It was hoped that the Corfu meeting would mobilize a common political will to provide a structured format for the dialogue on European security with a focus on specific areas in all three dimensions, including the following areas expressly mentioned: increased efforts at resolving regional conflicts, a strengthening of the OSCE's co-operation with other organizations on the basis of the Platform for Co-operative Security, and the sounding out of the OSCE's potential with regard to new security policy challenges such as climate change or energy security. Finally, the hope was expressed that the meeting in Corfu would set the course for the Ministerial Council meeting in Athens, at which a substantial agenda for a European security dialogue could be adopted.

Another delegation pointed out the far-reaching consequences of the 2008 war between Russia and Georgia for the entire OSCE area and in particular for the Organization's ability to put its conflict prevention and early warning mechanisms into effect. It stated that

their effectiveness had been limited by Russia's lack of political will to apply them in a full and efficient manner. Subsequently, the delegation provided its account of the Russian aggression towards and occupation of Georgia in 2008. Furthermore, the delegation gave its views on how the existing mechanisms could be further improved, specifically proposing that the existing confidence-building, conflict prevention and early prevention mechanisms could be utilized more fully if greater emphasis were placed on accountability and transparency. The implementation of existing commitments should be subject to constant scrutiny, and the OSCE's co-ordination and co-operation with other relevant international actors should be improved, notably in the field of information-sharing. Moreover, ways to further strengthen the ODIHR (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights) and the HCNM should be explored. Finally, it was suggested that further non-consensual mechanisms should be set up within the OSCE for cases in which a country is ready to obstruct and defy shared values as enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act.

The next delegation drew the attention of the participating States to the contribution by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly (PA) to the discussion on European security. The upcoming 18th Annual Session and the Winter Session of the PA were mentioned as particularly important events in this regard. The delegation noted that the PA remained committed to engaging with respect to security challenges.

The next delegation started its intervention by citing the fundamental principle of the OSCE that all participating States have an equal right to security. Against this background, unresolved conflicts created different zones of security and undermined both the stability of States and also regional co-operation. In addition, the delegation noted that parts of the OSCE area had been turned into "black holes" where agreed measures on arms control, CSBMs, border controls, and human and minor rights could not be implemented and verified. These areas had the potential to develop into safe havens for illegal activities. Turning to the OSCE's role with regard to conflicts, it was suggested that measures should be taken to:

- Improve the involvement of field operations in addressing the consequences of conflicts;
- Assess the reasons why the use of the OSCE toolbox has been limited so far.

The inability to activate OSCE mechanisms and the Organization's perceived inability to deal with regional crises as demonstrated by the conflict in Georgia should not be seen as grounds to challenge the existing security institutions and mechanisms or the agreed commitments. Instead, their validity and integrity should be reconfirmed through the display of the political will necessary for their activation.

Another delegation spoke in favour of further consolidating the OSCE's capacity in conflict prevention and resolution. Enhanced interaction with other relevant international actors, such as the European Union and the Council of Europe, would support conflict resolution efforts and strengthen the OSCE as a forum for broad security dialogue. The same delegation voiced its conviction that the Transdniestrian conflict could be solved if all parties concerned were to show the necessary political will. It also noted that the package proposal remained valid and that a high-level donor conference could mobilize means for post-conflict rehabilitation efforts. The same delegation suggested enhancing the capacities of the OSCE Mission to Moldova to facilitate political dialogue and implement confidence-building

measures, both in the economic and social sphere and also in gradual disarmament and demilitarization.

The Head of the OSCE Mission to Moldova gave a briefing on the latest activities with regard to the settlement of the Transdniestrian conflict and risk reduction, including a seminar on CSBMs organized by the Greek OSCE Chairmanship in Vienna, which had permitted the holding of an informal “5+2” meeting.

According to another delegation, the internationally accepted legal right to self-determination of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh meant that the peaceful and just resolution of the conflict was of utmost importance. Recent developments, including meetings between the Presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan, were signs of progress in the process for which the OSCE Minsk Group had proven to be an effective and credible format.

The next delegation suggested that thought should be given to how the OSCE’s policies and approaches might be changed to help it to perform its tasks more effectively under present-day conditions. It argued that regional conflicts should be prevented and settled on the basis of universal principles. The Russian initiative for a treaty on European security was largely aimed at enshrining these principles in law. According to the delegation, Georgia’s military aggression against South Ossetia in August 2008 had represented a most flagrant violation of international norms and humanitarian principles. Besides, it had seriously undermined the authority of the OSCE. In this context the delegation expressed its hope that negotiations could be resumed on the future OSCE presence in Georgia and South Ossetia. Regarding other protracted conflicts, there had been progress on Nagorno-Karabakh, but the situation with respect to the Transdniestrian conflict had remained unchanged.

The next speaker stated that the violation of minority rights was often a root cause of unresolved conflicts. It was therefore suggested that any discussion on European security should include national minority issues and take into account the Bolzano/Bozen recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities.

Another delegation highlighted the importance of regional co-operation and of the elaboration of stable regional mechanisms for security in Europe. In this context, mention was made of diplomatic efforts by Serbia with regard to Kosovo and of the work of the OSCE Mission in Kosovo (OMIK) on the basis of a status-neutral approach.

The next delegation supported OSCE activities with regard to the prevention and resolution of conflicts and emphasized the role of field operations. In this regard it deplored the closure of the OSCE Mission to Georgia but spoke in favour of continued OSCE engagement in Georgia through such bodies as the HCNM, the CPC, the ODIHR and the Chairmanship. In general terms, this delegation suggested working on improving OSCE instruments and mechanisms with respect to conflict prevention while taking account of the fact that sometimes not all participating States showed the political will to use existing instruments. In this connection, it was suggested that consideration should be given to the possibility of making more resources available to the CPC.

Another delegation considered that the OSCE was uniquely positioned to be active in conflict prevention, in particular through its field operations and the HCNM. It furthermore maintained that the existing set of documents, institutions and procedures was quite

impressive and that, before discussions on potential new tools were started, existing instruments should be reviewed.

In its second intervention of the working session, one delegation spoke about the alarming security situation in the North Caucasus region and suggested that the OSCE, including the HCNM and the ODIHR, should deal with this problem by providing an inclusive platform for addressing challenges to security and stability in this particular region. This intervention provoked an immediate response from another delegation, which agreed that there are grave security problems in the North Caucasus due to internal and external developments but assured participants that it had taken steps necessary for the resolution of the problems.

In his brief concluding remarks, the moderator recommended that existing OSCE mechanisms should be re-examined with an eye to their appropriateness and applicability.

Recommendations and suggestions

- The OSCE's capacity in the area of early warning and conflict prevention and resolution must be enhanced on the basis of agreed principles and UN Charter Provisions.
- The OSCE should improve its instruments and mechanisms with respect to conflict prevention;
- The OSCE should develop unified approaches to the prevention and peaceful resolution of conflicts in the OSCE region.
- OSCE institutions and field operations should remain instrumental for early warning, conflict prevention and conflict resolution, as they have the capacity to address all phases of a conflict cycle;
- In view of occasional instances of lack of political will causing difficulties in the activation of OSCE mechanisms, it is advisable that non-consensual procedures in the area of preventive action and crisis management should be developed.
- The OSCE could consider taking a more active role in the region of Northern Caucasus, particularly through the HCNM and ODIHR.

WORKING SESSION II: POLITICO-MILITARY ASPECTS OF SECURITY: ARMS CONTROL ARRANGEMENTS AND CONFIDENCE- AND SECURITY-BUILDING MEASURES IN THE OSCE AREA

Keynote speakers: Ambassador Klaus-Peter Gottwald, Federal Government Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control, Federal Foreign Office, Germany

Professor Vyacheslav Nikolayevich Kulebyakin, Chair of International Law at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations

Moderator: Ambassador Eric Lebédel, Permanent Representative of France to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Mr. Valerio Negro, Permanent Mission of Italy to the OSCE

The main focus of the session was on efforts in the field of arms control agreements and confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs). In particular, participants reviewed the state of play concerning the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty regime; the Vienna Document 1999 (VD 99), also considering possible ways to develop it further and improve its implementation; and the Open Skies Treaty.

Ambassador Gottwald recalled that the dialogue between participating States at the ASRC and in various other OSCE forums could build on the discussions that took place at the high-level meeting of experts in Berlin on 10 June 2009, which dealt with the future of conventional arms control. According to Ambassador Gottwald, the delegations present at that meeting agreed that arms control, disarmament and confidence-building were key elements for an integrated security policy in the Euro-Atlantic area. He underlined that today's and future challenges are and will become more diverse, and even if they were increasingly of a non-military nature, the attempt to prevent an arms build-up remained part of a responsible and preventive security policy, as did efforts to remove the causes of tension. The keynote speaker pointed out that there was a broad consensus on maintaining and, where necessary, adapting the current European arms control architecture, the main elements of which were the CFE Treaty, the VD 99 and the Open Skies Treaty. These elements had to be strengthened (especially the CFE and the VD 99, which had suffered considerable damage in recent years) in order to be able to still perform their original role and prove effective in tackling regional and subregional crises. The Berlin conference had once again reaffirmed the essential importance of the CFE Treaty in European security, underlining the urgent need to overcome the current crisis, either by using the elements provided for by the Agreement on Adaptation or by placing further instruments alongside the CFE Treaty itself to jointly support the overarching architecture. Therefore, it must remain a priority to counter any further erosion of the CFE Treaty and to prevent any spillover effect onto other arms control instruments. If the current CFE crisis was to be overcome, the focus on the "parallel actions package" had to be maintained. Moreover, the role of conventional arms control in protecting stability and security in the OSCE area had to be preserved and expanded.

Professor Kulebyakin drew the attention of participants to the process that had followed the disintegration of the USSR and of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, arguing that a consistent display of good will and compromise by the Russian Federation had been met by a policy of enlargement (both in membership and scope) that ran counter to the wider interests of global stability. The current crisis related to the situation surrounding the CFE Treaty was in Professor Kulebyakin's opinion a consequence of this course of action, the Treaty having had the purpose of establishing a balance of conventional armed forces that was no longer matched by the political and military reality in Europe. The ongoing situation could be overcome by using the "parallel actions package" as the basis for a comprehensive document on the restoration of the viability of the conventional arms control regime in Europe, leading to a process of provisional application of the Agreement of Adaptation and finally to its entry into force. Professor Kulebyakin argued that the VD 99's provisions were manifestly out of touch with today's requirements, but that proposals for its modernization (also providing for an exchange of information on naval forces and multinational rapid reaction forces) had been blocked by a number of countries, thus imperilling the viability and the relevance of the Document itself. An opportunity for rethinking the situation in the OSCE common space was now offered by the Russian initiative to conclude a treaty on European security, which should be swiftly followed up on. The initiative was not to involve the contemplation of the dismantling of existing institutions or the abandonment of security agreements and arrangements already in force, but was to help focus attention on hard security issues and also to drive the discussion at the OSCE away from peripheral issues.

Discussion

A number of delegations took the floor, contributing to a lively debate.

One delegation argued that the OSCE was the most appropriate but need not necessarily be regarded as the only forum for a dialogue on the future of European security. Discussion on the subject should build upon existing principles, commitments and institutions, and maintain a cross-dimensional approach. The delegation further stated that the greatest risks in the Euro-Atlantic area were of a regional and subregional character and that an effort must therefore be made to allow these risks to be adequately mitigated by the existing mechanisms, tools and CSBMs. In this regard, the current crisis surrounding the CFE regime must be overcome and the Treaty must be adapted, as appropriate, to the current international situation.

One delegation voiced its concern about the lack of progress concerning the ratification of the Agreement on Adaptation of the CFE Treaty. The delegation noted that the provisional application of the Treaty was an interesting suggestion, pending agreement of the States Parties on the basis of the "parallel actions package".

Another delegation argued that the political crisis related to the CFE Treaty was rooted in the different strategic perspectives held by States Parties on the post-Cold War reality, and that maintaining accountability, avoiding any potential rise of arms supplies, and overcoming the block-to-block approach should be retained as priorities in the pursuit of the entry into force of the Agreement on Adaptation.

Another delegation argued that the so-called "first dimension" of the OSCE had seriously deteriorated since the end of the previous decade, and that immediate action was needed to restore, strengthen and develop the arms control regime and the CSBMs. In order

for this to be done, the disarmament sphere should be given a more solid legal basis. Also, more efforts were needed to overcome the crisis surrounding the CFE Treaty on the basis of the so-called “parallel actions package”. Finally, the delegation argued that the VD 99 should be updated. In order to revitalize the politico-military dimension of the OSCE, consideration should be given to organizing a second special meeting of the FSC on the future of arms control in Europe, and also to the adoption of a draft Ministerial Council decision this year, urging participating States to work more energetically on arms control and CSBMs.

Another delegation reaffirmed the value of the OSCE and the FSC with regard to significant security challenges and the implementation of CSBMs in the Euro-Atlantic area. It also stressed the importance of the fulfilment of existing commitments, first and foremost the CFE Treaty, the implementation of which had been suspended by one State Party. The current political crisis related to the CFE Treaty had the potential to undermine the essential trust and security the CFE regime had provided to the OSCE area for years. Hence, efforts must be intensified to find a solution to the crisis that would take the concerns of all Treaty partners into account. The nexus between terrorism and non-proliferation as an area where the OSCE could build capacity and make a significant contribution to preventing proliferation was also highlighted.

Another delegation underlined the important role that confidence-building measures could play in helping to settle long-standing issues in the conflict zones. It argued that enhanced accountability and improved transparency measures were necessary to ensure greater compliance with the CFE Treaty’s commitments.

Another delegation underlined the fact that the provisions of the CFE Treaty, by creating an increased sense of security for all OSCE participating States, had brought equal benefits to its States Parties and to those outside the Treaty. It stated that the political crisis related to the CFE Treaty should therefore be promptly resolved on the basis of the so-called “parallel actions package”. The importance of the promotion of regional security through the adoption of bilateral arrangements was stressed, as was that of expanding existing CSBMs between participating States.

Another delegation agreed with the previous delegation that the CFE Treaty remained one of the key elements of conventional arms control in Europe and that its regime must be preserved in order to guarantee stability and security on the continent. At the same time, the continued significance of the CSBMs should not be overlooked, and new measures could be envisaged, in particular on a regional scale.

Another delegation supported the “parallel actions package” as a promising basis for further negotiations to overcome the political crisis related to the CFE Treaty, emphasizing at the same time that existing commitments must be fulfilled. According to this delegation, OSCE commitments and principles of international law had been violated by one participating State in August 2008. Moreover, the subsequent agreements brokered by other participating States with regard to the conflict in Georgia had also not been fulfilled, leading to an undermining of stability in the whole OSCE area.

Finally, a further delegation agreed that the OSCE’s attention should remain focused on arms control and that the CFE Treaty and that the VD 99 should be modernized. It argued that consideration should be given to proposals for a provisional application of the Agreement on Adaptation of the CFE.

In closing, the moderator identified several themes common to the interventions, including: the recognition of the importance of the existing instruments and the need for their improvement; the central role of the existing mechanisms of conflict prevention, which were to be strengthened also through the revitalization of arms control (and first and foremost of the CFE Treaty); the ongoing significance of the OSCE, and within it of the Forum for Security Co-operation, in any debate on a renewed framework for military security.

Recommendations and suggestions

Working session II therefore offered the following suggestions and recommendations for further consideration:

- The OSCE instruments of crisis prevention and crisis management must continue to be underpinned by the concept of “indivisible security” in the Euro-Atlantic area and other key principles such as those contained in the Helsinki Final Act;
- A broad, multi-dimensional and all-encompassing concept of security must be preserved;
- Existing arrangements/institutions dealing with European security should not be dismantled, nor should security agreements and arrangements already in place be abandoned;
- The OSCE should be recognized as the most appropriate forum for discussion on the future of European security;
- The impact of technological developments and new aspects of the command and use of armed forces should be taken into greater consideration;
- Some provisions of the VD 99 should be modernized, providing for the inclusion of exchange of information on naval forces and multinational rapid reaction forces;
- A program of immediate action should be worked out in the field of arms control and CSBMs
- The possibility of the application of CSBMs at a regional and subregional scale in order to prevent local conflicts and crises should be fully explored;
- An innovative approach of “reciprocal parallelism”, preserving the principles of balance and regional stability, should be adopted;
- The CFE Treaty remains an essential pillar of European security, and priority should continue to be given to the countering of any further erosion of the CFE regime and to the prevention of a “spillover” affecting other arms control instruments;
- A treaty on European security could confirm and make legally binding basic principles, criteria and tasks in the field of arms control;

- Intensified negotiations on the draft “parallel actions package” could overcome the CFE Treaty crisis;
- Another special FSC meeting on the future of European arms control as a follow-up step to the Berlin conference of 10 June 2009 should be convened;
- The existing bilateral negotiating channel on the CFE Treaty must be fully pursued in order for multilateral discussions in other venues to be productive;
- Full advantage should be taken of the opportunity offered by the second review conference on the Treaty on Open Skies in 2010 to make further progress in its implementation, e.g., through “digitalization”;
- A draft Ministerial Council decision should be elaborated on the future activities of the FSC with a special focus on arms control and CSBMs;
- More attention should be drawn to the link between counter-terrorism and non-proliferation work and the OSCE should build on its strengths and increase its involvement in this area.

WORKING SESSION III: THE OSCE'S COMPREHENSIVE AND CO-OPERATIVE APPROACH TO PREVENTING AND COMBATING TERRORISM AND RELATED THREATS

Keynote speakers: Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde, United Nations Special Advisor on Counter-Terrorism

Professor Yonah Alexander, Senior Fellow at the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies and Director of its International Center for Terrorism Studies

Moderator: Ambassador Kairat Abdrakhmanov, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Mr. Andrew Hyde, US Mission to the OSCE

The main focus of the third working session of the Annual Security Review Conference was on exploring the possibilities for realizing the OSCE's concept of comprehensive security in combating terrorism. A special emphasis was placed on the implementation of OSCE Ministerial Council Decision No. 10/08 and the resulting 1 April report of the Secretary General on OSCE counter-terrorism activities (Report of the Secretary General on OSCE Counter-Terrorism Activities, 2001–2008 in Implementation of MC.DEC/10/08).

The first keynote speaker, Mr. Laborde, looked at other multilateral efforts to combat terrorism and described the experience of the UN Counter-Terrorism Strategy adopted in 2006. One key element of the strategy was the explicit link with regional security organizations such as the OSCE and the role they play in implementing UN Security Council resolutions and conventions on terrorism. He outlined the role of the UN Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (TF), emphasizing that while the main responsibility for implementing UN Counter-Terrorism Strategy rested with member States, the TF provided support and guidance. As a regional organization, the OSCE could also work with the TF and act as a catalyst. Mr. Laborde enumerated the four pillars of action on which the UN Counter-Terrorism Strategy rests: 1) measures to address the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism; 2) measures to prevent and combat terrorism; 3) measures to build State capacity to prevent and combat terrorism and to strengthen the role of the United Nations system in that regard; and 4) measures to ensure respect for human rights for all and the rule of law as the fundamental basis for the fight against terrorism. The UN had been particularly effective in implementing pillars 2 and 3. The OSCE could continue to make an effective contribution to pillars 1 and 4 while also contributing to the overall strategy through conflict prevention efforts. Mr. Laborde concluded by stressing the lasting importance of regular exchanges of information between global, regional and functional organizations and the priority of protecting human rights through the fight against terrorism.

The second keynote speaker, Professor Yonah Alexander of the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, underscored the importance of so-called "soft" power in the fight against terrorism. Efforts such as those undertaken in the OSCE's human dimension, for example, put a spotlight on the effect of terrorism on its victims rather than on the message of the

perpetrators. It was also important to look at factors contributing to terrorism, such as socio-economic characteristics and ethnic, racial and religious environments. Intensified nationalism, increased narco-trafficking, the arms trade and environmental changes were cited as potential inputs to terrorist activities. Some governments or national groups might also be sources of contributions to terrorist movements outside of their borders. Professor Alexander listed four categories of trends that have a negative or positive impact on the likelihood of terrorism: threats to safety, welfare and civil rights; the stability of the State system; the strength of national and international economies; and the expansion of democracy. Suggesting that the threat of terrorism was going to increase, he urged the OSCE to think about its economic, political and psychological costs and to consider the possibility of an escalation to “super-terrorism” involving weapons of mass destruction. The bottom line of the OSCE’s work should be a variety of methods aimed at assessing the nature of the threat and how it is perceived by the public and political leadership. He concluded by making two points: firstly, more open borders across Europe present new opportunities not only to terrorists but also to counter-terrorism efforts; and secondly, there are no simplistic solutions to terrorism, especially as it is often linked to other chronic security problems.

Discussion

The keynote speeches were followed by extensive discussion, during which conference participants made a broad array of observations and presented several ideas. Several delegations focused on the unique role played by the OSCE in the fight against terrorism – one pointed to the co-operative nature of its efforts, while another remarked that the OSCE’s comprehensive perspective on security, covering all three dimensions, was particularly relevant. A number of delegations asked about individual aspects of the OSCE’s counter-terrorism activities and how they fitted into a larger, global pattern of counter-terrorism work. A couple of delegations commented on the convergence of the OSCE’s counter-terrorism work with efforts by the Alliance of Civilizations. Other delegations pointed out the constructive contribution the OSCE’s counter-terrorism activities could make to the implementation of United Nations Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1810 (2008) on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

A few delegations noted that insufficient account had been taken of terrorism in the OSCE’s traditional definition of security challenges and that the OSCE framework for combating it had developed on an ad hoc basis over the past decade. One delegation stressed the need for a link between the “new” threat posed by terrorism and ongoing discussions on European security architecture. Another Delegation urged Professor Alexander to add a particular terrorist group to a list in his paper, underlining the danger it poses.

Several delegations commented on the excellent basis for this discussion provided by the Secretary General’s report on the OSCE’s counter-terrorism activities pursuant to Ministerial Council Decision No. 10/08. One delegation pointed out that the report provided a comprehensive look at the OSCE’s work and that the speakers’ presentations had provided a useful assessment of the value of those activities. A few delegations made reference to follow-up activities that they would be supporting; the realization of public-private partnerships, especially with media and on critical energy infrastructure, was highlighted. One delegation said the report underscored the broad-based expertise the OSCE had been able to build up in this area over the previous few years.

Building on comments from both speakers on the importance the OSCE places on protecting human rights in the fight against terrorism, a number of delegations highlighted this as a priority and an area where the OSCE has established a constructive track record. A representative of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights noted that the Organization's work in fighting extremism contributed to combating terrorism and stressed the importance of gaining the engagement of civil society in these efforts. One delegation noted that upholding basic human rights principles enabled the OSCE to become more effective in the fight against terrorism. Another delegation cited the OSCE's work to combat violent extremism as an excellent example of how the OSCE was capable of combining human rights and counter-terrorism work to good effect. Several delegations mentioned that visible co-operation among the various OSCE executive structures was of constant value in that it demonstrated the fusing of values and activities.

Several delegations noted the value of regional partnerships to the OSCE's work on counter-terrorism. One delegation underscored this point and urged OSCE participating States to consider supporting legislation outlawing ransom payments to terrorist groups and organizations. Several other delegations emphasized the contribution that the OSCE's efforts to fight terrorism could make to the Organization's assistance to Afghanistan, particularly with regard to counter-narcotics and border security.

Two delegations debated the degree to which disputed regions not completely under national control were breeding grounds for terrorism. One insisted that these "ungoverned spaces" provided implicit support for terrorists while the other pointed out that most transnational criminals in general operated from territory under the control of a national government.

Several subregional groups provided background on their activities and on ways in which they support OSCE efforts to combat terrorism. A delegation representing a group of States gave an extensive briefing on their work, highlighting agreements and activities in connection with law enforcement. A representative of the Commonwealth of Independent States detailed its implementation of five programmes of action dedicated to combating terrorism, trafficking in human beings, illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and their precursors, and illegal migration.

One delegation proposed that an OSCE political conference on the prevention of terrorism should be held in 2010 and suggested that counter-terrorism should become a regular feature of future, longer ASRCs. It also called for the reinforcing of the work of the Security Committee to give greater structure to the Committee's activities, in particular with a view to making it possible to extend regular invitations to meetings to representatives of specialized international agencies and national experts.

In closing, Mr. Laborde, in response to a question on the experience of establishing the UN Task Force, said that the final emergence of an identity for the group, after multiple contacts, was essential to its effective operation. Also, putting different representatives of organizations in charge of specific working groups helped forge agreement on tangible steps. Both keynote speakers urged the OSCE to give more thought to a strong contribution to efforts to counter radicalization and extremism. Furthermore, Professor Alexander urged delegations to continue to look at the whole picture of counter-terrorism work and not just the individual parts, also reminding them of the link of terrorism to organized crime and even maritime piracy.

Recommendations and suggestions

- The OSCE should continue to make an effective contribution to the implementation of the UN Counter-Terrorism Strategy, in particular through measures related to its first and fourth pillars;
- The OSCE should be strengthened in order to contribute effectively to the fight against new security threats, which raise challenges to European security in all three dimensions;
- As terrorism is one of the most serious threats to European security, it is important that co-operation among governments, international organizations and regional organizations is intensified to combat it effectively;
- The role of the OSCE in non-military aspects of security should be enhanced, inter alia by promoting the ASRC, organizing relevant supplementary meetings and strengthening Secretariat capacity as well as the work of the Security Committee.
- The OSCE should look at factors that contribute to terrorism, such as socio-economic characteristics and ethnic, racial and religious environments;
- The OSCE should think about the economic, political and psychological costs of terrorism and consider the possibility of an escalation to “super-terrorism” involving weapons of mass destruction;
- The bottom line of the OSCE’s work should be a variety of methods aimed at assessing the nature of the threat and how it is perceived by the public and political leadership;
- There is a need to link the “new” threat posed by terrorism and the ongoing discussions on European security;
- Protecting human rights in the fight against terrorism should be made a priority for the OSCE’s counter-terrorism work;
- OSCE participating States should consider supporting legislation outlawing ransom payments to terrorist groups and organizations;
- Counter-terrorism should become a regular theme of future ASRCs;
- The OSCE should organize a political conference on the prevention of terrorism, to be held in 2010;
- As the OSCE has the capacity to provide added value, inter alia by identifying new cutting-edge technology related to counter-terrorism, it should enhance its co-operation with other relevant international organizations in this area.
- The OSCE could examine the possibility of elaborating a draft Athens MC Decision on combating the threat of illegal drugs and could consider holding a conference on the combating of drug trafficking in 2010.

CLOSING SESSION

Closing address by: Ambassador Mara Marinaki, Chairperson of the Permanent Council

Ambassador Marinaki, representing the Chairperson-in-Office in her closing address, said that the Chairmanship was very pleased with the outcome of the Annual Security Review Conference, which had taken place against the background of serious challenges to security and stability coupled with important proposals for a renewed dialogue on European security. The overall theme of the ASRC, co-operative security, had proved to be the right focus for discussions on major security concerns, and the Conference had paved the way for a structured and focused debate at the informal ministerial meeting on Corfu and beyond. Ambassador Marinaki stressed that a debate on European security must be based on the concepts of co-operative and comprehensive security and that it should involve all OSCE participating States.

Ambassador Marinaki further noted that the work of the 2009 ASRC had benefited greatly from the address of the high-level guest, H.E. Mr. Sergei Lavrov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation as well as from the thoughtful and thorough presentations by keynote speakers, which had set the tone for discussions in the various working sessions. She subsequently highlighted several aspects of these discussions, *inter alia*:

- There was general agreement that the OSCE should remain the key forum for discussions on the future of European security, on account of its wide geographic span, its comprehensive concept of security, and the fact that all OSCE participating States have equal status;
- There was agreement that the fundamental principles of the OSCE, enshrined in particular in the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris and the Charter for European Security, and also in the Platform for Co-operative Security, remained the irreplaceable basis of comprehensive and co-operative security and for structured dialogue on that subject. Participating States should build on this basis to acquire a broader view on European security also encompassing ways to address risks and challenges stemming from outside the OSCE area, including those originating in Afghanistan;
- The OSCE capacity in early warning, conflict prevention and conflict resolution must be enhanced on the basis of agreed principles in these areas;
- Arms control, disarmament and confidence-building constitute the key to an integrated security policy in the Euro-Atlantic area. In this regard, it was stressed that existing institutions should not be dismantled and that security agreements and arrangements already in force should not be abandoned;
- The CFE Treaty has a central position in European security and ways to overcome the current crisis should be explored. In this regard, it was noted that intensified negotiations on the “parallel actions package” would be the main way forward;

- The ASRC made it clear that the OSCE needed to find efficient ways to address new threats to security. In this regard, the link between combating terrorism and non-proliferation was highlighted and calls were voiced for the OSCE to build on its strengths and increase its involvement in this area;
- The fundamental elements of the fight against terrorism must take account of its root causes, including their political, economical and social aspects. Efforts to combat terrorism should respect international law, the rule of law, and human rights.

In closing, Ambassador Marinaki gave voice to the Chairmanship's conviction that the ideas expressed during the Conference demonstrated the existence of many common elements on which participating States could further build their dialogue on the future of European security, and that there was common ground for continuing a cross-dimensional process in this connection, starting with the informal ministerial meeting on Corfu.