



OSCE Security Days

Revitalizing Trust and Co-operation in Europe:
Lessons of the Paris Charter

16 OCTOBER 2020, PRAGUE



ANNIVERSARY
PARIS CHARTER
1990-2020

SUMMARY REPORT

Security Days

Revitalizing Trust and Co-operation in Europe:

Lessons of the Paris Charter

Overview

On 16 October 2020, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) organized a Security Days expert roundtable on "Revitalizing Trust and Co-operation in Europe: Lessons of the Paris Charter".

More than 100 participants from all over the OSCE area joined the virtual interactive discussion that commemorated the historic Charter of Paris and called on States to revive the spirit of the 1990 Paris Summit in order to overcome today's challenges, distrust and heightened tensions in European security.

The discussion reflected on the political and diplomatic history of Europe's reorganization in the late 1980s – early 1990s, and highlighted the turning points of the negotiations at the time, which led to the unprecedented convergence between East and West in the run-up to the Summit. Participants also reflected on current challenges and underscored the need for participating States to recommit to the OSCE's core principles, as contained in the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris, which are now facing their greatest ever threat. It was also argued that the OSCE needs more engagement by high-level political leaders to chart the way forward and find consensus on the future of the organization.

This report summarizes the extensive discussions at the event and the suggestions that emerged from them, with the aim of stimulating possible follow up. Further information about OSCE Security Days is available at <https://www.osce.org/sg/secdays>. Details about the 16 October 2020 event, including videos of the entire proceedings, are available at: <https://www.osce.org/secretary-general/465549>.

Background

At their first summit since Helsinki-1975, in November 1990 the Heads of State of the CSCE participating States adopted the Paris Charter, aimed at defining the CSCE identity in a new international environment that emerged with the end of the Cold War and seizing new opportunities for cooperation. The Paris Charter announced that "the era of confrontation and division of Europe has ended" and envisioned "a new era of democracy, peace and unity" based on democratic governance, the rule of law, and human rights, and relations among participating States founded on respect and co-operation. All participating States agreed that this was to be the bedrock on which they would seek to construct the new Europe.

The Paris Charter stated that Europe was "liberating itself from the legacy of the past" and reflected "the time of profound change and historic expectations" in Europe. The Charter served as a transition from the CSCE's role exclusively as a negotiation and multilateral dialogue process to an arrangement, which includes active operational structures to meet post-Cold War challenges. It thus started the institutionalization of the Helsinki Process. Resolved to give their co-operation a new impetus, the participating States decided that common efforts to consolidate democracy, to strengthen peace and to promote unity in Europe required a new quality of political dialogue, and established a permanent administrative infrastructure, which included a Secretariat, initially based in Prague, a Conflict Prevention Centre and an Office for Free Elections.

In the Paris Charter, participating States solemnly pledged their "full commitment to the Ten Principles of the Helsinki Final Act" and undertook or reaffirmed specific commitments across all three dimensions of security. These included the commitment "to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of our nations", to "promote economic activity which respects and upholds human dignity," to "intensify our endeavors to protect and improve our environment," and "to settle disputes by peaceful means." Participating States proclaimed again that "security is indivisible, and the security of every participating State is inseparably linked to that of all the others".

They also expressed their "determination to combat all forms of racial and ethnic hatred, antisemitism, xenophobia and discrimination against anyone as well as persecution on religious and ideological grounds."

The Paris framework remains one of the foundational stones of our entire Organization. The historical document remains relevant to address today's situation within the OSCE and will continue to serve as an inspiration to promote co-operative security in the future.

During the OSCE Security Day, participants had the chance to reflect on progress made over the past three decades in implementing and deepening the broad commitments in the Paris Charter;

The Security Day focused on five main objectives:

- 1) Understand the historical context, learn from the negotiations and clear articulation of the Paris Charter to seek ways out of the current stalemate and on a common vision.*
- 2) Identify future perspectives and recommendations on how to increase mutual understanding about different historical interpretations, without focusing only on the historically contested parts, and engage in forward-looking dialogue that may help to recreate trust.*
- 3) Consider how the legacy of the Paris Charter is embodied in the institutional framework of the OSCE, focusing on achievements of OSCE structures established through the adoption of the Paris Charter as well as constraints that they face and ways they have evolved to meet new challenges.*
- 4) Reflect on the ideas developed by the Cooperative Security Initiative in order to shift momentum in favor of cooperative security and multilateralism in the OSCE area.*
- 5) Use the real potential of youth to shape new narratives, drive positive change, and engage actively in peace-building and conflict transformation processes since young people have no memory of the Cold War conflict and no fixed worldview on the tensions from the post-Cold War period.*

Welcome and Keynote Remarks

Keynote-speakers praised the Paris Charter and underlined that the document was negotiated in times when states were able to commit to principles to overcome divergence and antagonism and work together to build a secure and prosperous common space based on common values and interests. The Officer-in-Charge/Secretary General of the OSCE, Ambassador Tuula Yrjölä highlighted in her welcoming remarks the optimism the Charter reflected at the time. The Paris Charter optimistically portrays a coming post-Cold War period as “a new era of democracy, peace and unity.” The Paris Charter is a remarkable consensus agreement on far-reaching new commitments among the states of Europe and North America across all three dimensions of security. The institutionalisation of the CSCE, which broadened its activities, was one of a number of concrete steps taken to heal the former East-West divide in Europe.

The Paris Charter established the model that is still with us today: a set of executive structures, with consensus-based mandates and guidance from the participating States, supporting and reporting to them. Although it is not a perfect system, it serves the participating States by providing platforms for dialogue, by assisting them in addressing the common security challenges and implementing their commitments.

The Minister of Foreign and European Affairs of the Slovak Republic, Ivan Korčok praised the scope of activities that OSCE carries out for member States in conflict areas but also pointed out that diplomatic efforts are not bringing tangible results. He stressed that we are still far from seeing the project of New Europe take its desired shape and he explicitly highlighted the ongoing crises in Nagorno-Karabakh and Belarus.

Minister Korčok stressed that we are witnessing attempts to politically kidnap the OSCE, its work and decisions, even the procedural ones. He quoted last years’ Bratislava Appeal: “failure to reach consensus is a failure of us all – we who are accountable to our citizens and responsible to each other for the full implementation of the OSCE’s norms, principles and commitments.” He added that in 2020 – 30 years after the Charter of Paris was adopted – we still encounter exemptions to one of its strongest opening notions – namely, that “Europe is liberating itself from the past”.

The Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, Martin Povejšil, stressed that the OSCE acquis we have been building for decades is here to be upheld and further developed. Strict adherence to the OSCE principles and commitments is a necessary precondition to move forward. We cannot revitalise trust and cooperation in Europe when the fundamental OSCE rules are blatantly violated and foreign policy concepts based on privileged zones of influence are being pursued by some.

The Chairperson of the Permanent Council, Ambassador Igli Hasani, stated that when the Paris Summit took place in 1990, social and political change was only beginning to sweep through his country, Albania. It was only in 1991 that Albania joined the CSCE, thus consolidating a dramatic departure from four and a half decades of strict communist rule. This moment marked a substantial change in the course of their foreign policy, freeing them from international self-isolation and bringing them closer to the Euro-Atlantic community, based on a shared commitment to the principles and values of freedom, democracy and rule of law.

The keynote-speakers agreed that when recalling the spirit of Paris, all participating States need to restate the OSCE principles and the determination to implement these commitments. The OSCE needs renewed strategic direction, an openness to reform and last but not least sufficient resources. There is a need to bring back the genuine political will of all participating States that we have seen in the early nineties and bring back the spirit of willingness to find common ground and solutions, rather than individual profits.

It was stated that the potential of the OSCE is not being fulfilled or fully utilized by participating States and that these trends need to be reversed. The OSCE is a diverse organization and this can lead to divergence in security perceptions. However, there can be no divergence from our founding principles and shared commitments, including those agreed in Paris. Keynote speakers agreed, that it is important that the participating States continue to entrust the OSCE executive structures with important mandates to continue building cooperative security.

Video Messages from key personalities

After the remarks of the keynote-speakers, participants had the chance to hear testimonials from witnesses who were involved in the negotiations at the Paris Summit. Participants viewed video-messages from **former US Secretary of State James Baker**, who had a leading role in the negotiations of the Paris Charter and in shaping a new Europe as well as from **Ambassador Wolfgang Friedrich Ischinger**, who was part of the freshly reunited Germany's delegation at the Paris Summit.

In his video message **former Secretary of State Baker** underlined that the Paris Summit was an optimistic and almost festive event and was further evidence of the peaceful end of the Cold War that had divided Europe. Former Secretary of State Baker emphasized that the Charter of Paris encapsulated so much that was positive about the process that had begun with the Helsinki Final Act in 1975. He added that it envisioned a new and inclusive continent based largely on Western values, particularly the value of democracy. Secretary Baker regretted that solemn commitment in the Paris Charter - particularly those of human rights and democracy as well as peaceful settlements of disputes among states - continue to be violated by some that signed up to these commitments. He concluded by stressing that States should fulfil the promises they made in the Paris Charter 30 years ago and draw on the example of the Paris Summit to find new ways to cooperate in meeting 21st century challenges.

Ambassador Ischinger pointed out that the Paris Summit took place just after the celebration of unity of the reunited Germany, which was a wonderful milestone. It opened a historic window of opportunity to transform not only Germany into one country but also to create a free and united Europe. The entire Euro-Atlantic space, including the Soviet Union, was considered as one security space. Ambassador Ischinger added that the German delegation went to the conference with very high hopes since it was the final moment of cementing the future of a Europe at peace. In closing, Ambassador Ischinger conveyed the message that we should not forget the window of opportunity that the Paris Summit created and we should try to use the example and model of Paris to try to regain a European order of peace for generations to come.

The Paris Charter as an inspiration: Highlights and turning points of the negotiations, which lead to the unprecedented convergence between East and West

The first thematic session focused on the highlights and turning points of the negotiations of the Paris Charter. Panellists pointed out that the **main bone of contention in the negotiations was the institutionalization of the CSCE**. Most of the Paris Charter confirmed what had been agreed upon in previous meetings, but it also innovated dramatically on structure and essential principles of democracy. Such an outcome was extraordinary and was an interesting junction at the time. The constant push by EC countries but also from the Soviet Union for a solid structure as well as by key participants' played a key role. There was a mixture of expectations – euphoria mixed with geopolitical concerns about the power vacuum it could create. It was a moment of chaos but also a creative moment to set up a proper structure for the future. **The extraordinary element was the agreement on democracy**. A continent frozen into two competing blocks now faced the opportunity to become one, free and at peace.

Participants highlighted that the Paris Summit was a follow-up from various initiatives from different countries. As a preface to the summit, two important documents were signed. **The joint declaration of 22 States, signed by 16 NATO States and 6 States of the Warsaw Pact confirming the end of the cold war. The second important document was the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.**

It was also noted that Mikhail Gorbachev's role cannot be overstated as he proposed the summit ahead of the scheduled 1992 follow-up meeting. His **speech about a common European home** was the beginning to overcome the division in Europe but he also pushed a new aspect, namely the aspect that people should be able to choose their political regime.

The Charter of Paris stipulates that a steadfast commitment to democracy, human rights and the rule of law was at the core of a new emerging order. The document gave birth to the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and since then participating States have adopted a wealth of commitments in the human dimension that constitutes ODIHR's mandate today. A panellist highlighted that what is important for the human dimension is the underlining element that **democracy and the protection of human rights are the best guarantees for creating free and open societies and the best prevention against possible human security threats**.

The panellists agreed that **today, the consensus of the 1990s is showing deep cracks and not every country within the OSCE region shares the values of democratic pluralism, the rule of law and respect for human rights**. And even if they are accepted in declaratory ways they are often rejected in political practice. Moreover, we do not see much consensus nowadays. We are back to confrontational times and there is institutional fatigue. There is at the moment no common vision and the road ahead seems increasingly steep and obstacles increasingly prohibitive.

Participants called for a possible summit of European leaders in order to identify solutions in order to revive the OSCE agenda. Others supported a call to revitalize the interest of national governments in the OSCE. However, it was highlighted that a Summit is usually the peak of a negotiation that was prepared well in advance in a preparatory committee and not a place where the negotiations take place. Panellists suggested revitalizing the practices from the CSCE process during the confrontational

years of the Cold War, which were **more informal gatherings, “coffee meetings” of key groupings to find common ground**. Only when that can be achieved might we be able to re-launch a Summit. Another panellist added that the Paris Summit was possible because of human aspirations reflected in civil society groups and social movements. What would be imperative would be for **international organizations to work together to prioritize support to social movements and civil society, and to mobilize support to them**.

Lessons learned and recommendations:

- The CSCE produced confidence-building measures and became THE framework for conventional disarmament. There was a strong commitment from EC member states to call for security, cooperation and dialogue. There was also a **strong commitment from neutral and non-aligned countries to advance proposals and play a bridge-building role**, which proved essential. Panellists **encouraged smaller Eurasian states to take initiatives if Europeans won't do it**.
- There is a necessity to **identify key stakeholders**, or a **“spokesperson/champion”** to overcome the current confrontational attitudes.
- The pandemic underscores that **Europe needs leaders who unite us**. Today Europe needs to adapt to new realities and States need to **recommit to unity**. The Troika is a good start but one needs an engine for developing progress.
- **There is need for connecting the “West” to Russia and to consider what is now in the interest of the Russian Federation** at the OSCE.
- The CSCE was open-ended and **procedurally different** than the OSCE. It created the need for decisions to keep the process going. Nowadays we have pre-set meetings, schedules and set agendas. Today, if at the end of the day no agreement is achieved, the OSCE still continues to run. It may be timely to review certain procedural aspects of the OSCE's work.
- Panellists agreed that there is a need for more **support and involvement to and from civil society**, but not in the same way as before. It is important to find a way to **bring together social movements and governments**. Civil society should be understood to include not only **human rights** groups but also **youth, students, trade unions, universities** and the **OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic Institutions**.
- **“People to people” contacts** are essential to rebuild trust.
- If we look at all the multiple challenging issues, we need a **positive compelling vision** and not just complaining about what doesn't work. There is a need for leaders who can convey such a vision.

The future of comprehensive and co-operative security in the OSCE area, three decades after the Paris Charter

The second session reflected on ways to shift momentum in favour of cooperative security and multilateralism in the OSCE area. Participants noted that the Charter of Paris was talking about unity in the OSCE, which was a reality in the early 1990s. But gradually, by the end of the 1990s, we returned to geopolitical competition and security structures in the OSCE space not reflecting the visions of the Paris Charter. This division did not stop the OSCE from functioning. However, some panellists added that the Istanbul Summit (1999) was the last Summit where there were real significant decisions taken. Soon afterwards, there were problems implementing such decisions. The OSCE was slow to recognize

the division, accept it and work on the basis of the divisions. It was also highlighted that since 2002, Chairpersons-in-Office keep trying to work on political declarations without success.

But panellists also pointed out that **the OSCE has also been able to operate, suggesting it should face reality and work on this basis. Some examples of very successful engagements were highlighted:**

- In 2004 the electoral crisis in Ukraine, where the OSCE managed after long negotiations to launch a series of roundtables, the result of which was that the elections were repeated with a robust ODIHR observation mission.
- In 2005, when the Presidential Palace in Kyrgyzstan was stormed, the OSCE managed to put together an OSCE package to support the transition.
- The Ukraine crisis in 2014 is obviously the most visible example. Under the leadership of the Swiss Chairmanship, the OSCE encouraged and facilitated dialogue among key interlocutors to manage tensions and avoid further escalation of violence, ultimately leading to establishment of the Trilateral Contact Group and the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission in Ukraine. No other international organization managed to operate in that space, not even the UN. This was a strong demonstration of the ability of the OSCE to insert itself into a difficult and sensitive space, because of its inclusiveness.
- OSCE's role in facilitating voting in Kosovo for Serbian parliamentary and presidential elections without addressing the status question is another example.

Participants questioned why these engagements are not happening today and came to the conclusion that there is lack of political engagement, attention and will as well as a leadership gap. They added that there is a lack of decisions by Ministers, who are too aloof. Participants pointed out that in 1990 leaders such as Willy Brandt, Vaclav Havel, Mikhail Gorbachev – who felt security was important – were personally very engaged. **Participants stressed the need to find ways to enhance political attention and support for the Organization.**

Participants noted that one of the challenges to **cooperative security** today is a **resurgence of great power competition**. Neither the OSCE nor any other international organizations are in high demand at the moment. One panellist suggested looking at three elements:

- Big players could start discussing the issue of “**interference**” (interference in strategic infrastructure and elections as well as hacking and leaking) which neither the Russian Federation nor the USA likes.
- There is a need for a narrative for security policy. The Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and GLOBSEC with the support of the OSCE Office of the Secretary General has started a **cooperative security initiative with 18 experts looking at 19 questions concerning security in the OSCE region**. It is the “society in general” that should be concerned and it is up to us to picture the concern. The Cooperative Security Initiative is this kind of idea.
- **There is a need to make sure politicians understand the urgency**. It was highlighted that politicians need to be pressured to make sure that this is a subject they have to discuss.

It was noted that **it would be reasonable to draw the conclusion that there is no alternative to the spirit if not the letter of the Paris Charter. It was also acknowledged that the OSCE is more functional than the NATO-Russia Council and that the organization stands out as a pan-European institution which is flexible.**

According to one of the experts, the OSCE has two overlapping agendas:

1. **The unfinished agenda of the 20th century.** There is still a disorder to clean up, where the OSCE can be helpful. The OSCE can facilitate confidence-building measures as an institution that can compare security narratives and handle protracted conflicts.
2. **The agenda for the 21st century that is not divisive and can unite East and West** (for example the climate agenda, managing migration and cybersecurity / interference).

A member of the Youth Core Group of Experts in the OSCE Perspectives 20-30 initiative highlighted the importance of exchanges for young people mentioned in the Charter of Paris. Despite the 2014 Basel Ministerial Council declaration on youth (reconfirmed in 2015 and 2018), it is not certain whether the Paris Charter commitment has been realized to its fullest potential. Although States agreed on principles on youth, these are neglected in practice. It was noted that there is a **lack of trust in youth**. There is also a lack of faith that there is political will to tackle the international problems that will become the future for youth.

It was explained that the lack of trust has worsened since the traditional media changed as people tend to read the news on social media. It creates filter bubbles, algorithms that create frustrations and anger. “Networks of misinformation” create hate speech and violence. It was suggested that **the OSCE must respond faster to intolerance, racism, xenophobia and conflicts that occur in local communities, particularly in post-conflict regions. Greater attention should be paid to education. Risks can be prevented early, connecting young people across historic and current divides.**

Observations and recommendations:

- The OSCE should narrow the agenda and focus on issues where it can make a difference.
- States have tended to put more responsibility on the shoulders of the OSCE Institutions, which puts Institutions in the position of being “used” instead of focusing on their role of assisting participating States.
- The peer to peer review should return and the role of the participation of civil society should be discussed in that context.
- Lively debates seem to have disappeared in many ways at the OSCE. The result is that States have a dialogue with the Chairpersonships but not among themselves. The Chairpersonship is then in a position to mediate and filter the discussions, which is a very big burden. The dialogue should be put back at the centre of the organization. There is a great need to create a space for dialogue even if it is controversial and complicated.
- Comprehensive, cooperative and indivisible security remain the key combination of the conventional arms control and confidence-building measures in Europe. There is a need for mutually reinforcing and complementary the use of the Vienna Document.
- The OSCE has a useful past and success stories including its work on Ukraine (such as the Trilateral Contact Group, the SMM and humanitarian work) that can be looked at and/or duplicated in other areas.
- In post-conflict education, the OSCE and “security” don’t often come up. The OSCE should bring in experts from other fields and there is, moreover, a need for a “marketing strategy” to reach audiences that are speaking in different forums in different ways, outside the “security bubble”.

- The global agenda and the OSCE role under Chapter VIII is important, but the OSCE needs to focus on areas that are particularly important.
- There is a need to market peace, not just as the absence of war but as an issue linked to concepts like development, justice and equality.
- One of the key problems is the lack of focus by Ministers on the OSCE. How can the OSCE be better sold to the Ministers? There is a need to go back to the beneficiaries, those in the field who have seen their lives improved as a result of work from Field Offices, Institutions and the Headquarters. This should be showcased through video-messages during the next Ministerial.

Lessons learned, best practices and future perspectives

In the third session, a member of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly highlighted that the Paris Charter called for a greater Parliamentary role, in particular through the creation of the Parliamentary Assembly, involving legislators of all participating States. Since its early stages the Parliamentary Assembly offered a platform for exchange among representatives from “old” and “new” democracies to share best practices and important information in order to exercise their functions. **They share information and bring it to the national level, acting where necessary as translators for colleagues that might be less familiar with the OSCE.** Over the years, the relationship between the Parliamentary Assembly and the OSCE has evolved into genuine cooperation. Today the OSCE executive structures and the Parliamentary Assembly work together in a non-competitive, collaborative and complementary spirit. This can be exemplified by the growing number of common statements of the Parliamentary Assembly and other OSCE structures. **The elected status of Parliamentarians gives independence to parliamentary diplomacy that can at times open the doors for dialogues that are not available for Governments.** The Parliamentary Assembly brings immense contributions to the OSCE election observations missions. During the past 29 years, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly has engaged in more than 180 observation missions across the OSCE region. In its institutional role, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly has engaged in various reflection exercises. **Today the Parliamentary Assembly is a proactive driver of change.**

It was argued that parliamentary diplomacy should be considered as one of the most inclusive and effective contributors to resolution of political deadlocks. After the failure to reach a consensus on the reappointments of the Heads of Institutions, the Parliamentary Assembly addressed an open letter to the Ministers of the participating States and organized a brainstorming exercise to deal with the current institutional crisis. Parliamentarians discussed major challenges of the OSCE, highlighting that the current leadership vacuum is not a crisis per se but rather a consequence of long-term challenges such as a general lack of interest in the OSCE by a good number of ministers of participating States. The Parliamentary Assembly stands ready to generate new political interest and bring back high-level political attention to the OSCE. In this regard **the Parliamentary Assembly proposes a political manifesto to be signed by high-level political personalities to recommit to the principles of the OSCE and overcome the current crisis.**

One of the experts mentioned that 30 years ago, President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev was awarded with the Nobel Peace Prize. It is important to go back and look into **Gorbachev’s idea about a common European home** (1989 speech in Strasbourg). In his speech he envisaged a collective

security architecture for Europe (including the USA and Canada), with a **balance of interests, a humanitarian dimension, a robust regime of environmental protection and mutual respect for everybody's security interests**. The vision was for military alliances to gradually become political institutions by the mid-1990s and the CSCE to become the main security institution. However, the USA had a strong preference for NATO being the main security institution in the North Atlantic region.

It was added that it is exactly at the moment when CSCE became institutionalized at the Summit in Budapest 1994, that **Russian President Yeltsin gave a speech about a cold peace** that replaced the cold war. Again, there was a **profound lack of trust** and a complete **breakdown of confidence building measures**. The European security system of the OSCE failed in its main mission of keeping peace in Europe.

It was pointed out that in 1990 Russia looked at the OSCE not only as an organization for security but also as an organization that would help integrate Russia into Europe. Now, if one looks at the OSCE through Russian eyes, one sees an organization employing double standards. Various Russian appeals for "cooperative" security were made in the last 30 years, including by President Medvedev in 2008. After the "colour revolutions", the Russian Federation became even more suspicious of both the OSCE and NATO. **Many experts have come to the conclusion that Russia has to have a voice and veto in a European security architecture. Russia has to be substantively involved with legitimization of its security interests.**

One participant commented on the idea that the participating States should focus on common security challenges and observed that this is currently not the mainstream at the OSCE and questioned whether participating States are ready to engage in a dialogue on some areas where they agree, while recognizing that there are other areas where they disagree. It was argued that the OSCE has platforms for dialogue that are not really used, such as the Structured Dialogue. The problem we face is the lack of commitment to a constructive dialogue. It was noted that appointing the top four officials would be a first step in the right direction. The next step would then be to identify minimal programs on things we can agree upon, areas for progress and dialogue, and to promote military to military dialogue.

An expert noted that the Hamburg Peace Research Institute and the German Federal Foreign Office co-hosted the Virtual Round Table "30 Years Charter of Paris: Lessons for Pragmatic Cooperation in the OSCE Area". During this event the Charter's weaknesses and strengths were highlighted. One of the strengths identified is **the document's comprehensive character and strong normative basis. The most relevant negative elements identified during the event were the weak institutionalization of the CSCE, and that it was not sufficiently prepared for preventing and managing conflicts**. As this has remained true until the present day, according to one of the experts, it is essential to look into the **preparedness** of the Organization for conflict prevention and management:

First, the bible of the OSCE's conflict management preparedness is the famous Decision 3/11 of the Vilnius Ministerial Council meeting. Next year this document becomes ten years old, and it is natural that it needs continuous updates. Germany tried this during its 2016 Chairmanship, but could not reach consensus. However, the German Chair issued a report "A Stronger OSCE for a Secure Europe – Further Strengthening OSCE Capabilities and Capacities across the Conflict Cycle" that is still worth reading. The view was expressed that one key aspect in this context is **better co-operation among international organizations engaged in conflict prevention and management, thereby strengthening**

effective multilateralism. Therefore, the following suggestions were made: 1) **Joint trainings for members of field operations,** 2) **Joint procurement schemes for mission equipment,** 3) **Mutual secondments and liaison persons,** 4) **Developing joint country-specific policies** and 5) **joint statements, particularly in crisis situations.**

Another recommendation made was to look into **the role of the OSCE “quasi-peacekeeping” missions** such as the Kosovo Verification Mission or, currently the Special Monitoring Mission in Ukraine. Both missions are run by civilian staff, but nevertheless fall under the definition of one type of UN peacekeeping operations, so-called observer missions. It was, however, argued that there is one substantial obstacle to OSCE peacekeeping: It is almost certain that the participating States would not agree on a classical military peacekeeping operation. However, one could question whether this classical type of operation is necessary or even desirable. Beyond that, it was suggested that a civilian OSCE peacekeeping operation could be ‘hardened’ and equipped with high-tech tools – Unmanned Aerial Vehicles of different range, satellite imagery, cameras – as this is already the case with the SMM. The OSCE could run a peacekeeping operation together with another international organization, sharing the work, most probably the UN.

Lessons learned and recommendations that were highlighted by panellists and participants during the discussion:

- More awareness about the OSCE should be developed through civil society.
- National parliaments should exercise their oversight powers by generating political pressure on their Governments in regard to the implementation of the OSCE commitments.
- There is a need to rebuild trust and this could be done with confidence building measures.
- We need to stop the hostile rhetoric.
- Participating States need to address the total disappearance of arms control agreements. The technology is evolving very fast.
- The OSCE should identify three key problems on which the Russian Federation and Europe could successfully engage: Strengthening health systems in the wake of pandemics, climate change and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
- States should look to the future, focus on common emerging threats like terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking and illegal migration.
- With regard to a peacekeeping role, it was suggested staying below the threshold of classical military peacekeeping that requires a UNSC mandate.
- The rise of China should be raised in the OSCE, which would provide another window for engaging Russia cooperatively in strengthening European security with consideration for a new bipolar system coming into existence.
- While celebrating the 30th and 45th anniversaries of the Paris Charter and the Helsinki Final Act, we do not have heads of institutions. It is time to start with the symbolism of selecting the Heads of institutions.

Closing remarks by the Director of the Office of the Secretary General, Luca Fratini

In his concluding remarks, the Director of the Office of the Secretary General, Luca Fratini, expressed satisfaction that the virtual Security Days roundtable had contributed to a broad-ranging discussion of important topics of clear relevance to the OSCE and its participating States. Ambassador Fratini offered four general observations and summarized the suggestions made during the day.

Summary

Observations:

- Without the Charter of Paris we would not have the OSCE as we know it today. The Charter of Paris laid out a vision for the future of Europe and beyond. Building upon the core principles of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, the Charter's signatories pledged to build societies based on pluralist democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, economic liberty, adherence to international law and a commitment to multilateralism, among other tenets.
- The Charter also institutionalized the organization and strengthened its capacities by creating permanent structures. The development of its comprehensive approach to security, the establishment of autonomous Institutions and the setting up of its field operations, which remain among its most effective instruments, are reminders of what the organization has achieved over the 30 years.
- The OSCE is no longer the instrument of détente that it was in the 1970s and -80s, and is not exactly the engine of democratic transformation that it was in the 1990s. But over the past 30 years, it has developed capacities which are not replicated in any other regional organization and has accumulated a wealth of experience and expertise, as well as a comprehensive toolbox that have enabled us to assist the OSCE participating States.
- The OSCE's broad membership and its comprehensive, multidimensional approach to security remain unique on the European security stage. This approach is manifest every day in the activities of the OSCE's Institutions and in the activities of its Vienna-based Secretariat and its field operations.

Suggestions:

- First, given the democratic deficit and divisions that persist in the OSCE area today, there is a need for participating States to recommit to the OSCE's core principles, as contained in the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris, which are now facing their greatest ever threat.
- Second, the OSCE needs more engagement by high-level political leaders to chart the way forward and find consensus on the future of the organization.
- Third, more attention should be drawn to addressing global threats and common challenges that face all participating States, even as dialogue continues on those issues that divide them.

- Fourth, in a period marked by mistrust and deep-rooted ideological conflict, the fact that leaders as diverse as they were in 1990 sat together and agreed on the text of the Paris Charter was a remarkable achievement. We have to make sure to get back to the modus operandi we had 30 years ago. Even in times of differences we need to invest in dialogue.
- Fifth, we should dedicate much more time to conceiving and proposing processes that could actually fix the situation.
- Sixth, we should make sure to better involve civil society, youth and experts and make the OSCE better known and understood, both at the level of society and political leaders.

ANNEX

Agenda and Guiding Questions

09:45 – 10:45 Welcome and Keynote remarks:

Ambassador Tuula Yrjölä, OSCE Officer in Charge/SG
Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, Tomáš Petříček
Minister of Foreign and European Affairs of the Slovak Republic, Ivan Korčok
Ambassador Igli Hasani, Chairperson of the Permanent Council

10:45 – 12:00 Session 1: The Paris Charter as an inspiration: Highlights and turning points of the negotiations, which lead to the unprecedented convergence between East and West

Moderator: **Ambassador Christine Fages**, Head of the Permanent Mission of France

Video Messages:

- **James A. Baker, III**, Former U.S. Secretary of State and White House Chief of Staff under President George H. W. Bush
- **Ambassador Wolfgang Friedrich Ischinger**, Chair of the Munich Security Conference (was part of the German delegation at the Paris Summit)

Panel:

- **Dr. Angela Romano**, Lecturer in International Political Economy, University of Glasgow
- **Ambassador Dana Huňátová**, Former Director General of the Executive Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia (1989-1992)
- **Katarzyna Gardapkhadze**, First Deputy Director of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) / alternate to the Director

Questions that may be addressed:

- What were the highlights and turning points of the negotiations? Which were the windows of opportunities that created the unprecedented convergence between East and West, and what happened to it?
- What lessons for the current European security discussions could be drawn from good practices in the statecraft and multilateral diplomatic dialogue that produced the Paris Charter in 1990?
- How can we enhance mutual understanding about different historical interpretations in the future?
- How did the OSCE evolve since then and what are the achievements?
- What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the OSCE institutional framework that the participating States began to erect through decisions embodied in the Paris Charter?

- What positive role have OSCE structures played in helping participating States to implement their commitments and build co-operative security, and what factors have limited the work of these structures in carrying out their mandates?

12:00 – 12:15 *Break*

12:15 – 13:30 Session 2: The future of comprehensive and co-operative security in the OSCE area, three decades after the Paris Charter

Moderator: **Ambassador Igli Hasani**, Chair of the Permanent Council of the OSCE

- **Ambassador Lamberto Zannier**, Former Secretary General of the OSCE and former High Commissioner on National Minorities of the OSCE
- **Dr. Reinhard Krumm**, Head Office Friedrich Ebert Stiftung ROCPE
- **Dr. Andrey Kortunov**, Director General Russian International Affairs Council
- **Heather Mann**, OSCE Perspectives 20-30 Core Group of Experts, University of Oxford

Questions that may be addressed:

- In which areas have participating States most successfully implemented the commitments they undertook in the Paris Charter across all three dimensions of security?
- What have been the most serious challenges and obstacles to implementation of commitments, including those that may not have been foreseen in 1990?
- How is it possible to make sure that the current situation does not permanently endure, and that we return to real cooperative security in Europe in the future?
- What questions raised and findings by security policy experts will help to chart the way forward?

13:30 – 14:30 *Lunch break*

14:30 – 15:45 Session 3: Lessons learned, best practices and future perspectives

Moderator: **Ambassador Tobias Lorentzson**, Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Sweden

- **Kristian Vigenin**, Vice-President of the OSCE PA and Vice-President of the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria
 - **Dr. Svetlana Savranskaya**, Director of Russia programs at the National Security Archive, George Washington University
 - **Dr. Wolfgang Zellner**, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH), Former Head of the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE)
- The final session will reflect on future perspectives and recommendations on how to increase mutual trust and engage on dialogues that are forward-oriented.

15:50 – 16:00 Conclusion: Ambassador Luca Fratini, Director of the Office of the Secretary General