

---

**Keynote Speech**  
**by**  
**Ambassador Lamberto Zannier**  
**Secretary General**  
**The Organization for Security**  
**and Co-Operation in Europe**

---

**2012. 5. 31**

**7:30-9:00a.m.**

**Diamond Hall, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor, the Plaza Hotel Seoul**

Keynote Speech

*“The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe:  
A Regional Model of Security Cooperation”*

by

**Ambassador Lamberto Zannier**  
**Secretary General, The OSCE**

The 43<sup>rd</sup> Korea Foundation Forum,  
May 31, 2012 at 7:30-9:00 a.m.  
Diamond Hall, 22nd Floor, the Seoul Plaza Hotel, Seoul

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to be here today, and I wish to thank the Korea Foundation for the hospitality and the opportunity for me to share with you some considerations in relation to my work. In particular, I would like to thank the President, Ambassador Kim, and his colleagues for their initiative.

This is my first trip to Korea, but I'd have to say after being in the job for less than a year, I have had ample opportunity to witness the strong engagement of Korea as a corporation partner of the OSCE, within the organization. Today I will meet with the Foreign Minister, and I realize that he was also ambassador to the OSCE at some point in his career before taking up this post. Before that, I worked for the UN, and the Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, my boss, was also Ambassador of Korea to Austria and is very familiar with the OSCE.

My presentation comes at an important time in the OSCE. It's a time when there is a fundamental debate starting: where the organization is going and how it should be developed. Taking into account the strong revolution of the geopolitical, strategic positions in the wider Europe as we look at it, from the OSCE perspective since the time of Helsinki, the organization has evolved a lot. It was a Conference at the time, and once the Cold War was over, the job for the OSCE was to manage this equation that resulted from it, including the dissolution of certain countries like the former Yugoslavia, and the former Soviet Union. Still there is a lot of that work ongoing, but then with the turn of the century, we started looking at the global issues, and our own approach to security changed in many ways.

Security, traditionally from the time of the Cold War, was looked at from the perspective of security as a zero-sum game. The arms control, the search for balance, and the search for stability. At some point this equation changed because the global challenges became such that the security could be perceived by many as a win-win situation as countries cooperate on addressing the threat of terrorism, and addressing organized crime and trafficking, etc. Then

the mode of operation changes, and the way the organization equips itself to deal with it also changes.

I'm now in Korea, and I'm looking forward in particular to my participation in the Jeju Forum tomorrow. This trip will also bring me to Mongolia in the next few days, and that will also be an interesting new step because Mongolia has requested to become a full, participating state of the OSCE. Mongolia is now a partner country and has opened the discussion about the possible further expansion of the organization which is a regional organization – a regional organization under Chapter 8 of the UN Charter. The Mongolia issue is an interesting debate, and I'll refer to that per se in a minute. However, it's also a sign that the agenda, what the OSCE stands for is something that is considered interesting by the participating states the countries that are not member states of the organization and that is an encouraging sign. Then from Korea we will proceed to New York where we will have a retreat with the Secretary General of the United Nations. At this retreat with the heads of a number of regional organizations, the Secretary General will be able to better discuss divisional labor between the UN and regional organizations.

That is also another element in our work that is developing very fast. When I say that there is still an agenda that we need to really rethink, and we are also looking at the time frame for that, 2015 will be "Helsinki plus 40" as we call it, the fortieth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act. Perhaps there will be a good occasion to try to develop an agenda that reflects the current state of affairs, taking into account all of these elements that I mentioned, the new approach to security, but also new relationships within the organization. There are debates and issues within the organization now.

There is an issue of unfinished reconciliation. Some of the conflicts and some of the issues that we still have on the agenda also go back to that. Go back to a problem that was solved in its immediate expression, but when the deeper roots still need to be addressed because there is still a possibility that a crisis may resurface. Therefore, we feel we need to be more thorough in the way we conduct the dialogue and deal with the relationships between our participating states.

The OSCE, I'll just try and define it very briefly. The OSCE is a regional organization, but it takes into account regional relations in a broader way, taking into account the geopolitical and the geostrategical considerations. So we have a transatlantic dimension because that's very visible when you're in Europe. There's also a Eurasian dimension, a dimension which we inherited in a way with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the Central Asian countries becoming full parties in the organization. The Mongolia debate is also an expansion of it.

This Eurasian dimension got even more profile in the organization with the Kazakh chair, a couple of years ago. Kazakhstan managed something that a number of previous presidencies didn't manage to do that was to have a summit of OSCE heads of states and governments, the summit that in fact started putting down the new agenda for the organization. It introduced the notion of a security community and this notion is something that we are working on.

To try to develop it as a new approach to security but still based on the Helsinki approach. The security that is viewed across various dimensions, as we call them, the narrower political and military set of tools that we have, the confidence building measures, the code of conduct and political military relations, the small arms issue and the work that is done on many small but very concrete aspects of security issues, and the relations between the military. I think that an important element in overcoming the legacy of the Cold War is developing relations between military establishments that used to consider each other enemies, and where, after a few years, we saw the military people coming together and being friendly to each other. That changed the spirit and created the basis for a new relationship in this wider community of countries.

The human dimension assisting countries in strengthening their democratic institution, upholding rule of law and human rights, fundamental freedoms are something that OSCE has always considered as an integral part of a broad concept of our approach to security. And we the OSCE can legitimately look into issues that countries may regard as having to do with internal affairs. Still this is something that can be done in the OSCE. There are, sometimes, very sensitive, very delicate, very difficult debates within the organization dealing with these issues, but the very fact that we manage to have those debates is very healthy, and it helps the organization and the community to proceed on its way in trying to deal with its problems, in some areas very successfully, in others perhaps less so. There is still, obviously, also work to be done internally for us.

Then we also have an economic dimension where we look at the security aspect. Of course we are not an organization that deals with development issues, but certainly there is a very strong commitment to assisting countries in developing smoothly, but also addressing those issues. Energy security is something that we are now discussing for instance, and it is very sensitive in Europe. The next chairmanship of the OSCE, Ukraine, has already told us they want to make the economic dimension a priority for themselves.

The issue of energy security is giving us an agenda that is very broad and very comprehensive. Astana also gave us another important concept, and that is the concept that the security of the OSCE states is inextricably linked, as stated in the Astana Document, with the security of its neighboring countries, and that is why we are paying more attention to the

relations that we have with our partners, and in some areas we increasingly operationalize them. For instance, on Afghanistan there was a decision by our ministerial council in December, and we are now really looking at how we can address Afghanistan related issues more concretely, more operationally.

For an organization like ours, it's not a matter of going into Afghanistan. Afghanistan remains a partner country, but we look at how we can work from Central Asia using the fact that Central Asian participating states are in a way the front line of the engagement for the OSCE towards Afghanistan and see how we can assist these countries in central Asia in two ways. One is to better protect themselves from the potential security challenges that could stem from Afghanistan, and we've taken a number of initiatives. For instance, in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, we have set up a border management staff college where we train about five hundred border guards every year. Then we train Tajik and Afghan border guards together so that the standards are not only the same but also they get to know each other and they work better together. We also work with other countries of the region. Some of them are more autonomous and need less support. Others need more support. In Tajikistan, again, we are now developing also a patrolling program on the border. The border is extremely long. It is 1300 kilometers, and the Tajiks do need support. We are looking at police cooperation in the region. So this is one mode of operation.

The second is with the Istanbul process looking at Afghanistan post2014. There will be larger responsibility, larger ownership for border countries of the region in dealing with Afghanistan and assisting Afghanistan. So the second mode is, in fact, helping those countries better assist Afghanistan and trying to be more strategic. We're having a discussion within the organization to see how we can best reach out to Afghanistan but still doing it primarily from the countries of the region and with the support of the whole OSCE community to the extent that this is possible.

The other area where we engage with partners more appreciably is the Mediterranean. The "Arab Spring" is having an impact on the security of the OSCE, and so we are reaching out also to the countries of the region where there are processes of democratic transition, which are obviously very different from the ones we have witnessed within the OSCE area. Still the experiences we have developed within the OSCE, some of the tools that we have created in the OSCE to address transition in our own area are relevant. They will need to be adapted, of course, in this situation. So we are now discussing individually with various countries in the region. I will travel to Jordan and Israel later in June to discuss initiatives or cooperation with those countries.

I had a meeting in Egypt with the Secretary General of the Arab League. I have seen that the Arab League is also looking at the OSCE with interest, because they would like also to

develop for themselves some more operational tools to address some of the problems that they have in their own region. So the interaction between regional organizations is something that is also developing, and that these, to go back to the initial point, is very much encouraged by the United Nations. The United Nations needs also to streamline their operations and to empower more the regional organizations, but in a way that is very synergistic. For us, we continue working very much on trying to prevent conflicts. That remains, in a way, the fundamental tool for our operation.

Just to give you an example, this month we have been involved in facilitating Serbian elections in Kosovo. That's something that only a couple of months earlier we didn't know we would be doing. We were planning on going to monitor, as we do in all our participating states, to observe the elections in Serbia. The answer was straightforward when I asked the Serbs, "How are you going to handle your elections in Kosovo?" The Serbs said, "Well Kosovo is Serbia, so we will go there, we will organize the elections, and our citizens will vote." Then we heard the Kosovars say that if solely the Serbs tried to organize elections in Kosovo, then we'll send in the special police units and close down all the polling stations. So we all thought we had a problem. The NATO people sent some reinforcement battalions and reserve battalions down to Kosovo. They were getting ready to manage a crisis there.

I traveled down with the chairmanship. I went to Pristina to talk with the Kosovo leadership, and to the NATO and EU people there. I went to Belgrade and in three weeks, we started negotiations, we found an agreement whereby the OSCE would organize the Serbian elections in Kosovo. OSCE flags were everywhere instead of Serbian flags. The Serbs gave us the voters' lists and all the voting material. We collected all the votes and gave the ballot boxes back to the Serbs. The Kosovars were happy because we did it under Resolution 1244 with the UN blessing, and it worked. It was an operation we had to set up in five days because that was the time that we had between the moment that we finalized the agreement of the two sides and the Election Day. We thought it would take us at least a month to do that, but when it needs to be done, it can be done one way or another, and perhaps they were not the model elections, but nobody was hurt. Everybody who wanted to vote managed to vote, and the votes went back, and the whole thing worked.

Now, as we're looking at the results of this, I was talking to the Secretary General of NATO and telling him, "You have your troops there. Please make sure that instead of dealing with a crisis that probably, we think won't happen, make sure they look after our people because we're not so sure how this thing will work." He was very forthcoming in that and very grateful when he saw he didn't have to use and didn't have to keep the reserve forces in Kosovo. He could withdraw them.

One of the things we notice is that by setting up this operation so quickly, we just

moved people in and it didn't cost us a penny. We really used the resources we had, replacing them, moving people. Of course, if you travel, then you need a few tickets, so two or three experts went down, but really it was a very inexpensive operation that prevented a situation that would have cost a lot in terms of human lives possibly, in terms of deployment of military forces, and maintaining them on the ground. Also, in terms of the political process that also might have hit obstacles. It's still complicated as it is in Kosovo of course, but it could have gotten even worse.

So working conflict prevention is in a way not expensive, and it's always a good investment for the international community. The downside of it is that it's not visible. When you are successful, nobody knows it. If I weren't telling you these things now, you wouldn't know it. That's the nature of these initiatives. It's always a hard sale, but it's always the best investment for the international community. It's a bit of problem that the OSCE has visibility, because we operate in preventing conflicts and we engage continually in dialogue, negotiations, etc. This is something that is not only invisible but sometimes it is willingly kept at a very low profile because the success of some of these initiatives very often depends on not letting anybody know that they are taking place and making sure that all the little crises and all the little problems are solved as we proceed.

On Korea's engagement, I think it's as I said at the beginning, Korea is a very active partner of the OSCE. We also have periodic updates to the permanent council from your Ambassador and from your representative in Vienna on the situation on the Korean Peninsula. Also with the Asian partners, in general, their interaction is stepping up.

I was, a couple of months ago, in Thailand. There was the annual conference with the Asian partners, and Thailand hosted a workshop on their own experiences in the "golden triangle" and cutting opium production and developing alternative forms of livelihood. Then we invited Afghan experts there, and it was very good to have this know-how of experts coming from one of our partner countries and relating it to the experience of another partner country. There the OSCE was chosen as the platform for this operation which I found was very, very interesting.

The Mongolians did something similar. They wanted to organize a workshop for Afghan diplomats, and they did it via the OSCE. Of course, when it comes to Afghanistan, we assist them a lot, and we also involve Afghans in many of our own initiatives. It was good that a country like Mongolia wanted to play this role, and we facilitated that and started also this sort of regional interaction.

So on Korea, I myself am looking forward to the Jeju Forum and to the discussions there, but I'm very pleased that I had this opportunity, and I'm looking forward to the meetings

I will have in the course of the morning. I will also be meeting with the Korean Foreign Minister. That will also be a good opportunity to see how we can move from here and how we can step up even more on our own interaction. Thank you very much for your hospitality and for this opportunity to talk to you this morning.