



**69th JOINT MEETING OF THE
FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION
AND THE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

1. Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2018

Opened: 10.05 a.m.
Closed: 12.50 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador A. Benedejčič (FSC) (Slovenia)
Ambassador A. Azzoni (PC) (Italy)

Prior to taking up the agenda, the Chairperson (FSC), on behalf of the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Permanent Council, delivered a statement concerning the death on 2 June 2018 of Brigadier General Pierpaolo Tempesta, Military Adviser to the Permanent Mission of the Holy See, and offered condolences to his family. The joint FSC-PC observed a moment of silence. The dean of the military advisers of the OSCE (Switzerland) and the Holy See also delivered statements.

3. Subjects discussed – Statements – Decisions/documents adopted:

Agenda item 1: SECURITY DIALOGUE: THE STRUCTURED DIALOGUE

Chairperson (FSC), Chairperson (PC), Chairperson of the Informal Working Group on the Structured Dialogue (Belgium), Bulgaria-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland and Liechtenstein, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra and Ukraine, in alignment) (FSC-PC.DEL/14/18), Turkey (FSC-PC.DEL/13/18 OSCE+), Switzerland (FSC-PC.DEL/10/18 OSCE+), Germany (FSC-PC.DEL/19/18 OSCE+), Canada, United States of America (FSC-PC.DEL/17/18 OSCE+), Azerbaijan (FSC-PC.DEL/9/18 OSCE+), Poland (FSC-PC.DEL/15/18 OSCE+), United Kingdom (Annex 1), Ireland (FSC-PC.DEL/12/18 OSCE+), Austria, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Belarus (FSC-PC.DEL/18/18 OSCE+), Finland, Romania (FSC-PC.DEL/11/18 OSCE+), Italy, Spain (Annex 2), France,

Ukraine (Annex 3), Georgia (FSC-PC.DEL/16/18 OSCE+), Russian Federation

Agenda item 2: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- (a) *Meeting of the International Partnership against Impunity for the Use of Chemical weapons, held in Paris on 17 and 18 May 2018*: France (Annex 4), Russian Federation, United States of America, United Kingdom
- (b) *Food-for-thought paper on contributions of the Forum for Security Co-operation to the 2018 Annual Security Review Conference, to be held from 26 to 28 June 2018 (FSC.DEL/110/18 Restr.)*: Chef de file of the FSC for the 2018 Annual Security Review Conference (France)
- (c) *Military exercise "Våreld 18", conducted in Sweden from 21 to 30 May 2018*: Sweden
- (d) *Workshop on reporting on small arms and light weapons and the OSCE online reporting tool, held on 29 May 2018*: Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre
- (e) *Matters of protocol*: Russian Federation, Chairperson (FSC)
- (f) *Seventh Annual Discussion on the Implementation of the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, to be held on 13 June 2018*: Chairperson (FSC)

4. Next meeting:

To be announced



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

FSC-PC.JOUR/56
6 June 2018
Annex 1

Original: ENGLISH

69th Joint Meeting of the FSC and the PC
FSC-PC Journal No. 56, Agenda item 1

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

The United Kingdom aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the EU but I would like to add a few comments in my national capacity.

I would like to begin by adding my thanks to the Slovenian FSC Chairmanship and to the Italian Chairmanship-in-Office for convening this joint FSC/PC meeting on the Structured Dialogue.

I would also like to thank Ambassador Huynen for his presentation this morning, and to express appreciation for the Chairperson's perception papers on the fifth informal working group (IWG) meeting, and on the second Workshop on Trends in Military Forces and Exercises. In our view, these are careful and balanced attempts to capture the main points of these events.

We agree with the vision of the Structured Dialogue set out by Ambassador Huynen at the commencement of his IWG chairmanship, as a twin-track discussion of threat perceptions and risk reduction, informed by the mapping exercise as an integral part of the Structured Dialogue.

We also welcome the transparent and inclusive manner in which he has conducted his IWG chairmanship so far, and his recognition of the Structured Dialogue as a long-term process, owned and driven by participating States, where progress will be incremental but where dialogue can potentially act as a confidence- and security-building measure.

The United Kingdom remains committed to the Structured Dialogue as a forum for added-value discussion on the current threats and challenges to security in the OSCE area. We remain of the view that it should focus on cluster one: challenges to the rules-based European security order and cluster three: inter-State tension of a politico-military nature; keeping cluster one clearly on the future agenda is important.

But we recognize that there are other views on content, we understand that addressing the wishes of 57 participating States is challenging, and we respect Ambassador Huynen's need to achieve a balanced Structured Dialogue programme this year. We were therefore

pleased that the Deputy Director of the UK's Joint International Counter Terrorism Unit was able to contribute substantially to the terrorism session at the fifth IWG meeting in April.

Turning to the Chairperson's perception papers, we welcome a number of the suggestions for the Structured Dialogue's future focus including enhancing risk reduction, military exercises and activities (including snap, split command and large-scale exercises close to borders, and how to increase transparency around these) and military incidents.

On the Chairperson's perception paper on the second Expert Level Workshop on Trends in Military Forces and Exercises, we welcome the clear recognition that threat perception is about more than just numbers: intent and capacity (in the sense of what one can do with the forces at one's disposal) are crucial too.

We agree that future expert-level discussions could take place based on an enhanced analysis and presentation of trends in force lay down, military exercises, military budgets and military incidents. We welcome the commitment to reinject and assess the outcome of the mapping exercise at the political level. It is only by joining the discussions in this way that we will get a better understanding of each other's threat perceptions.

The paper fairly reflects the balance of the discussion on the issue of updating and expanding equipment categories, including to reflect qualitative aspects. We remain of the view that this is beyond the agreement we reached on the parameters of the mapping exercise, would add little or no value to our threat perception and risk reduction discussion, and would in practice prove highly problematic given the subjective nature of qualitative assessments and the lack of available data.

As far as the data package is concerned, we support a further iteration to ensure participating States have the opportunity to add and correct information. We do not however envisage an ongoing process of data gathering and refinement since this would add little or no value to the understanding of broad trends, or to the security policy discussions which the mapping process serves.

Mr. Chairperson,

Three factors will have an important impact on the amount of further progress we make in the Structured Dialogue during 2018. Firstly, the degree to which we can foster genuine dialogue, building on the more detailed and franker exchanges we have had to date. Secondly, agreement to focus discussions on concrete issues of common interest. And thirdly, political will from all participating States to engage in good faith to address the security challenges we currently face.

Finally, Ambassador Huynen, I would like to thank you for outlining your proposed Structured Dialogue programme for the rest of 2018, which contains many issues of importance to the United Kingdom. Please be assured of my delegation's continued support to your successful IWG chairmanship in 2018.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, and I would like to request that this statement be attached to the journal of the day.



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

FSC-PC.JOUR/56
6 June 2018
Annex 2

ENGLISH
Original: SPANISH

69th Joint Meeting of the FSC and the PC
FSC-PC Journal No. 56, Agenda item 1

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF SPAIN

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I thank the Italian OSCE Chairmanship and the Slovenian Chairmanship of the Forum for Security Co-operation for organizing this joint meeting on the Structured Dialogue, which offers us a good opportunity to review the progress made to date, particularly following the interesting meetings held in the first half of the year, and to take stock in order to give fresh impetus to this process.

I also thank Ambassador Huynen for his enormous effort and dedication during the first phase of his Chairmanship of the Informal Working Group on the Structured Dialogue. He can be sure of the full support of my delegation in his efforts.

Spain aligns itself fully with the statement by the European Union and would like at the same time to share some thoughts in a national capacity.

First, I should like to emphasize once again the importance for Spain of the Structured Dialogue as a process, which provides spaces for understanding that will help to establish and consolidate a shared perception of the current and future risks and threats in the OSCE area.

The fifth meeting of the Informal Working Group held on 16 April offered an excellent opportunity for a more in-depth analysis of the perceptions of threats, risk reduction and de-escalation of tensions. We believe that the politico-military dimension is the most vital in the Structured Dialogue process, in line with the Hamburg Declaration establishing its mandate, but realize that this is a dialogue with 57 participants, in which the ideas of concern in varying degrees of intensity to other participating States must also be considered. In that regard, issues such as terrorism produced interesting and constructive contributions that will be taken into account in future work of the Security Committee, which Spain is chairing this year.

We believe that the mapping exercise is an appropriate instrument for obtaining a clear picture of the security landscape in Europe and helps at the same time to identify shortcomings that need to be addressed. For that reason, we appreciate it as a useful tool that should be of assistance in the Structured Dialogue process.

We firmly believe in the need for maintaining the political commitment and for greater involvement of the capitals in the Structured Dialogue as a long-term undertaking. It is important to make progress and to do this we need frank and genuine dialogue that makes a real contribution to confidence-building.

Finally, we see the second half of 2018 as a good time for continuing with the examination in greater depth of our perception of the politico-military threats and with the mapping exercise, and for making progress in the discussion on risk reduction and de-escalation of tensions. At the practical level, the military contacts provide an excellent co-ordination mechanism that makes an effective contribution to the latter.

Mr. Chairperson,

In conclusion, I should like to reiterate Spain's commitment to the Structured Dialogue process, including the mapping exercise that should support this process, and once again offer Ambassador Huynen our full backing and co-operation in his task as Chairperson of the Informal Working Group.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.



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

FSC-PC.JOUR/56
6 June 2018
Annex 3

Original: ENGLISH

69th Joint Meeting of the FSC and the PC
FSC-PC Journal No. 56, Agenda item 1

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF UKRAINE

Mr. Chairperson,

The delegation of Ukraine welcomes this meeting and wishes the Italian 2018 OSCE Chairmanship and the Chairperson of the Informal Working Group (IWG) on the Structured Dialogue, Ambassador Paul Huynen, every success in advancing the joint efforts in the framework of the Structured Dialogue. We also greatly appreciate the skilful way in which our collective work in the Structured Dialogue has been managed this year.

Not only is the Ukrainian delegation fully committed to the Structured Dialogue but this position is also strongly held in our capital. Furthermore, we have ensured high-level participation from our capital in nearly all the meetings.

The Ukrainian position on discussions in the Structured Dialogue has been made clear. In particular, as we confront the deepest present crisis in the European security order, which has resulted from flagrant violation by Russia of international law and of fundamental OSCE norms and principles, we proceed on the basis of today's realities. The situation needs to be examined in greater depth, with due consideration being given to the root causes of the crisis and to the matter of full adherence to existing OSCE principles. Given the complexity of the situation, it would be unproductive to prejudge the precise timelines and preliminary results of the discussions or to artificially expedite the process. It is essential to preserve the participating States' ownership of the Structured Dialogue and to have the time required to explore the various facets of the security-related challenges in depth.

The principles and ideas presented during the March 2018 meeting of the IWG on the Structured Dialogue are relevant and may be applied to our further work. We are grateful for the Chairmanship's constructive and well-balanced approach in this regard. Taking stock of developments during this year, we would agree that some progress has been achieved, not least in defining areas for further attention.

The discussion at the fifth meeting of the IWG revealed an urgent need for further work on mechanisms for risk reduction, de-escalation and incident prevention and management, in particular through the full implementation and modernization of the Vienna Document. We fully agree with the prevailing assessment that the current security situation and ongoing violations of the OSCE principles and commitment make it especially important to have these mechanisms in place. We see added value in such discussions and look forward to their continuation.

The second expert-level “mapping exercise” workshop proved that the scope of information exchange in the current CSBMs is not sufficient for assessing threat perceptions among participating States. We welcome the ideas raised at the meeting, in particular that more data-package information should be sought, in order to move closer to a complete picture for the analysis of threat perceptions and the identification of trends and in order to complete the data for all 57 participating States. It is therefore important to consider the so-called “grey zones”. In this connection, we would like to remind delegations of the fact of the illegal presence of two army corps commanded and controlled by Russia, with a total strength of over 35,000 troops on the occupied territory of Ukraine’s Donbas without the consent of the Ukrainian authorities. There are also more than two thousand servicemen of the armed forces of the Russian Federation serving as military advisers, instructors and in separate combat support and logistics units. Without due consideration of this information, the “mapping exercise” is destined to lag far behind the reality on the ground. We stand ready to provide further information on this Russian military force. In our view, assessments of contemporary military power should also take account of instruments of hybrid and cyber warfare.

As regards other aspects of the Structured Dialogue, we likewise consider it particularly important to pursue examination of the situation while bearing in mind the root causes of the current crisis and the question of full adherence to existing OSCE principles and commitments. Russia’s aggression against Ukraine, its illegal occupation and attempted annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, and its military intervention in the Donbas region of Ukraine are continuing and still represent an existential threat to my country and to the rules-based European security order.

The OSCE’s Istanbul Document of 1999 contains a clear commitment to exploring ways to increase the Organization’s effectiveness in dealing with cases of clear, gross and continuing violations of OSCE principles and commitments. This task is most relevant today and we consider it highly appropriate to deal with it within the Structured Dialogue.

In addition to the CSBMs, which play a crucial role in providing transparency and predictability and thus enhance confidence and security among the participating States, the instruments for responding to and dealing with violations of core OSCE principles and commitments should be further developed.

We consider that the Structured Dialogue could serve as an appropriate platform for working out possible ways to revitalize and modernize the existing OSCE instruments, or even for aiming to develop new ones that could be swiftly and effectively employed for the prevention and resolution of inter-State conflicts. The mechanisms will have to be more intrusive to ensure full verification in the case of an emerging crisis.

We are confident that such important discussions fall under the mandate of the Structured Dialogue. They are definitely in the interest of all participating States that seek a stable and rules-based comprehensive European security order and they have the potential to counter the plans of that order’s opponents.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.



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

FSC-PC.JOUR/56
6 June 2018
Annex 4

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

69th Joint Meeting of the FSC and the PC
FSC-PC Journal No. 56, Agenda item 2(a)

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF FRANCE

Mr. Chairperson,

Last week the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) met to commemorate a key event in the history of the twentieth century, namely the First World War. It was during the Great War that mass-produced chemical weapons were used for the first time in the history of mankind. They caused the death in terrible circumstances of 88,000 combatants and serious injury to 1,240,000 others.

A century later, we are still not rid of this scourge.

On 23 January 2018, we created the International Partnership against Impunity for the Use of Chemical Weapons. It aims to develop our co-operation to protect the Chemical Weapons Convention, to help identify those responsible for the use of chemical weapons in order to bring them to justice, and to support the work of the relevant specialist bodies of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the United Nations.

This Partnership has been in existence for barely four months, and it has already demonstrated its utility and effectiveness. We conceived it as an operative instrument combining in a hitherto unseen manner a response to the threat of chemical proliferation and the will to see international justice served.

Jean-Yves Le Drian, Minister for Europe and Foreign Affairs, chaired a further meeting of the Partnership on 18 May 2018.

He wished to bring together the participating States following the chemical attack causing several dozen deaths in Douma on 7 April, the use of a chemical weapon in Salisbury in the United Kingdom on 4 March, and the publication of the OPCW report on 15 May on a chlorine gas attack in Saraqib on 4 February 2018.

These two new cases of the use of toxic substances on two separate continents in the space of just a few weeks are worrying, all the more so as we have seen these arms used hundreds of times in Syria since 2012 by both the Syrian army and Daesh. We also saw these arms used in Iraq and then in Malaysia in 2017.

We have stressed that the re-emergence of chemical weapons is of concern to us all, and the impunity of those using them undermines the foundations of our system of collective security. The Partnership was created in response to the realization that it is not acceptable to remain inactive. The participants decided to convene a further emergency meeting in the wake of these two new major incidents.

Mr. Chairperson,

At that meeting, 34 States signed a declaration strongly condemning the use of chemical weapons by anyone and in any circumstances. The repeated use of chemical weapons in Syria by the Syrian armed forces, the use of a neurotoxic agent in the city of Salisbury against a British subject and a Russian citizen, and the use of a chemical weapon in a fatal incident on 13 February 2017 at Kuala Lumpur international airport were condemned.

The participants discussed ways of protecting the Convention and actions that could be undertaken to develop effective, impartial and independent instruments to identify those responsible for chemical attacks.

They also considered the possibility of bolstering the means and tools available to the OPCW with a view to strengthening its verification regime.

The Minister for Europe and Foreign Affairs took the opportunity to announce the freezing of the assets of 12 individuals and entities involved in the transfer of sensitive materials to Syria's main military chemical research centre, the Scientific Studies and Research Centre (SSRC). He also publicized a watch list of 48 persons whom France deems highly likely to have participated in the development and use of chemical weapons. France is following the activities of these individuals with the greatest attention and shares information on them with its partners.

Mr. Chairperson,

To date, over 30 States from all regions of the world have joined the Partnership. We are pleased to note that it is bringing together more and more participants and that our concerns are shared by many not yet participating States.

We solemnly urge those that have not already done so to join the International Partnership against Impunity for the Use of Chemical Weapons so as to give a clear signal that, like us, they oppose impunity for anyone responsible anywhere for the use of chemical weapons and that they are determined to put an end to it.

I thank you, Mr. Chairperson, and request that this statement be attached to the journal of the day.