

Check against delivery



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Conflict Prevention Centre**

**Amb. Lamberto Zannier
Director**

Challenges of Change:

**The nature of Peace Operations in the 21st century
And the continuing need for reform**

Ankara, Turkey

18 Nov - 21 Nov 2003

I welcome this timely opportunity to address you on the nature of possible future peace operations and the continuing need for change. Events in Iraq, in Afghanistan any number of other regions in the world graphically illustrate the nature of the threats faced today by international organisations. In the search to promote peace, and to assist countries bring stability and economic and social development, international organisations have had to adapt rapidly to ensure their continuing effectiveness. I hope today to be able to address some of the most important aspects of this reform process, building on the valuable and often challenging experience of learning lessons. Let me start also by pointing to the fact that these challenges require, more than ever, a concerted effort to improve co-operation in preventing conflicts before they evolve, a philosophy much integrated in the way OSCE works.

The OSCE “philosophy” is based upon a comprehensive approach to the three dimensions of security, namely politico-military issues, the economic and environmental area and the human dimension. Furthermore, the Organization has a co-operative approach to security, based on the premise that security is indivisible, that there is equal status for all States, and decisions are made by

consensus. This can sometimes be a slow process, but it underpins the concerted commitment to action by all member states.

When considering our Organisation's role in peacekeeping we need to take into account the fact that the past ten years have seen peace operations becoming increasingly complex, involving military, police and civilian personnel addressing a wider range of tasks and responsibilities. This has dramatically broadened the very definition of peacekeeping and profoundly changed its nature.

In this broad sense, the OSCE has played a very active role in conflict prevention, peace-making, peacekeeping and post-conflict rehabilitation. Indeed, our present 18 OSCE field presences are involved in a number of activities falling into this broad category of peace operations, and these activities have contributed significantly to dealing with different levels of crisis/conflict situations in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia. In fact, our Missions themselves have demonstrated to serve a much appreciated early warning/conflict prevention role.

Additionally, some of our current and ongoing operations, such as the Border Monitoring Operation in Georgia and our activities in the area of Policing (in particular, in the area of community policing, ethnic policing and Police Training), have many elements in common with activities that, from a UN perspective, would be considered an integral part of Peace Operations.

As a relatively young organization, the OSCE is no stranger to change. Following a profound restructuring and the institutionalisation of the organisation in the nineties, the Istanbul Summit 1999, by adopting the Charter for European Security, promoted new instruments to improve the efficiency of the Organisation in recognition of lessons learnt and the new challenges ahead. The main decisions included the promotion of a more regional approach to issues, the strengthening of cooperation with other IOs and NGOs and the establishment of the Platform for Co-operative Security. The adoption of this in particular greatly improved the OSCE's capacity to co-operate with other organisations, including those involved in broader forms of peacekeeping operations.

This Platform also called for a number of further initiatives to enable the OSCE Secretariat to better facilitate such activities. Specific efforts to enhance the Organization's capability to plan, deploy and manage field operations included the setting up of a small Operations Planning Unit within the Conflict Prevention Centre, the adoption of the Rapid Expert Assistance and Co-operation Teams (REACT) initiative as a means to rapidly recruit the experts

needed for fast deployments to new or enhanced missions, and more recently, the commitment to adopt an Integrated Resource Management Agenda (IRMA) system. These are all signs of strong political will on the part of participating States.

Additionally, there are political discussions ongoing in OSCE bodies on possible amendments to the 1992 Helsinki Document where it sets out the framework for any future OSCE Peacekeeping operations that might be called for.

I started by saying that today's peace operations have become increasingly multi-faceted and multi-dimensional, with solutions being sought by deploying together military, police and civilian components. Current crises have illustrated clearly the need for a benign environment in order that civilian components of such operations, which in turn makes rapid security sector reform a major priority. Experiences from Afghanistan and Iraq show the need to provide a strategic plan for the co-operation and co-ordination of international organisations and other supporting institutions before deploying people and supporters to the respective theatre. This strategic planning should be tailored to the situation on the ground, and has to include the political and operational exit strategy, and further measures as basis for the whole mission circle. These well-timed activities should enable the development of the Host Nation's capabilities to take over its own responsibility of the country supported by diminishing foreign institutions and the international organisations.

As a result of our experiences, the OSCE has activated an intensive dialogue with other international actors involved in our mission areas. This includes more and more structured exchanges at the HQ level, aimed at encouraging exchanges of visions and fine-tuning of strategies. This dialogue, however, complements - but cannot in any way replace - the vitally important mechanisms for co-ordination and co-operation on the terrain both at the political and the operational level.

In this connection, I would like to put forward some suggestions to further improve IC co-operation in the following areas, all of which are areas that will benefit from reform:

- Information sharing, especially in early warning;
 - Enhancing co-operation in fact-finding and monitoring missions, including possible set-up of joint "country co-ordination teams;"
 - Developing joint training programs for field officers prior to their deployment in the field; and
-

- Harmonisation of our working procedures.

- First, where necessary, partner organisations should introduce new modalities and establish new mechanisms for co-operation. But we also need to build more efficiently on the initiatives already launched and take more active advantage of each other's existing tools. For example, better use could be made of cross-conditionality: non-compliance with international obligations (ICTY or OSCE or Dayton) could be linked to progress in the relations with other organisations (e.g. SAP or PfP co-operation). We must see where and how we can complement each other, using experience gained, resources and mechanisms available. And we should respect the principle of inclusiveness and involve all relevant players.
 - Secondly, despite recent progress achieved, information sharing among partner organisations, especially in early warning, definitely needs to be improved. Early warning is one of the main functions of the OSCE Institutions and field offices. Regular reports and evaluations of the situation in a variety of locations and on a variety of issues are provided to the participating States, who themselves regularly share information in the Permanent Council. Better information sharing among partner organisations can be achieved through joint working level meetings directly in the field and between headquarters. The OSCE-NATO working level consultations between headquarters have become a good examples of such information sharing, and we are presently discussing ways to make even it more systematic and operational.
 - Thirdly, there is much room for improving co-operation in fact-finding and monitoring missions. One possible solution might be to set up, when needed, joint "country co-ordination teams", for example drawing on OSCE's permanent field presences.
 - Fourth, as we are doing today, we should as well in future continue our exchanges on lessons learned and evaluation, since this is an essential component of successful conflict prevention. Within the OSCE the Conflict Prevention Centre is, among others, responsible for developing an OSCE lessons learned process. An OSCE strategy in this area of activity, as well as a database, will be produced. It would be interesting to formulate truly inclusive common evaluations of joint operations with a view to developing common lessons learned.
 - Fifth, as proved by earlier practice, very often a major obstacle to smooth co-operation between partners in the field is the lack of reciprocal knowledge of goals, mandates, procedures, etc. One way to tackle this issue would be to provide each other with training modules on respective organisations, or to
-

develop joint training programs on relevant issues for field officers prior to their deployment in the field. Joint training should be a general aim, not least because common standards are already current practice in many areas. Joint exercises can also play a very important role in this process of getting to know each other's procedures better – but only if partner organisations are treated as real partners, and can participate rather than observe, and have access to relevant information.

It should be added here that while OSCE Permanent Council decisions can be fast, and subsequent deployment swift, there are instances when rapid deployment is not essential. Such scenarios present opportunities to conduct thorough needs assessments in order to ensure best possible complementarity between both government agencies and other international organisations.

OSCE's broad approach, based on the comprehensive concept of security, and of its inherent operational flexibility, has demonstrated a high degree of effectiveness in developing multidimensional activities. This has come about not least because it has built on the strengths of its "soft security approach", embracing as it does all of its three dimensions. Thus it has proved to be, along with all else, a successful partner for other organisations involved in peacekeeping and crisis management operations. The need for a coherent action by the IC in this respect does certainly make a difference. And OSCE stands ready to continue to play its part in the 21st century.
