



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

PC.DEL/646/08
18 July 2008

ENGLISH only

Chairmanship: Finland

2008 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 1 and 2 July 2008

CHAIR'S REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECISION NO. 838 DATES OF THE 2008 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE.....	2
DECISION NO. 846 AGENDA AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2008 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (ASRC)	3
CHAIRPERSON’S PERCEPTION	6
OPENING SESSION	8
WORKING SESSION I	13
ADDRESS BY GENERAL CRADDOCK.....	17
WORKING SESSION II.....	19
WORKING SESSION III	22
CLOSING SESSION	27



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

PC.DEC/838
31 January 2008

Original: ENGLISH

698th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 698, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 838
DATES OF THE 2008 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE**

The Permanent Council,

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

Decides that the 2008 Annual Security Review Conference will take place in Vienna on 1 and 2 July 2008.



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

PC.DEC/846
24 April 2008

Original: ENGLISH

710th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 710, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 846
AGENDA AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2008
ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (ASRC)**

The Permanent Council,

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

Taking into account its Decision No. 838, on the dates of the 2008 Annual Security Review Conference,

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

Decides to organize the 2008 Annual Security Review Conference in accordance with the programme, agenda and organizational modalities contained in the annexes to this decision.

2008 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 1 and 2 July 2008

Programme

Tuesday, 1 July 2008

- 10 a.m. – 1 p.m. Opening session
- 3–6 p.m. Working session I: Transnational challenges to security in the OSCE area

Wednesday, 2 July 2008

- 10 a.m. – 1 p.m. Working session II: The present state of arms control arrangements, CSBMs and the Security Dialogue in the OSCE area
- 3–5.45 p.m. Working session III: Early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, including the use of the relevant OSCE tools
- 5.45–6.15 p.m. Closing session

Agenda

Opening session (1 July 2008, 10 a.m. – 1 p.m.):

The opening session will set the stage for the Conference by looking back over the past few years and looking forward to the challenges that the OSCE will face in the future, under the theme “Challenges to co-operative security and OSCE responses”, taking into account the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century adopted in 2003. This session will provide an opportunity for the participating States and other participants in the Conference to share their views on the current security situation in the OSCE area, as well as on the status of implementation of OSCE decisions and commitments and how they could comprehensively be made operational.

Working session I: Transnational challenges to security in the OSCE area (1 July 2008, 3–6 p.m.):

Working session I will focus on the implementation of OSCE decisions on combating terrorism, illicit trafficking of weapons and drugs and the fight against trafficking in human

beings. The session will discuss the operationalization of the Border Security and Management Concept (BSMC) and reflect on the application of the BSMC in response to Ministerial Council Decision No. 4/07 on OSCE engagement with Afghanistan and other relevant decisions. Further steps that need to be taken with regard to the BSMC may also be discussed.

Working session II: The present state of arms control arrangements, CSBMs and the security dialogue in the OSCE area (2 July 2008, 10 a.m. – 1 p.m.):

Working session II will assess the current politico-military situation, the OSCE's response to emerging threats, and the value of the OSCE's security dialogue, its arms control arrangements and the CSBMs in the OSCE area. The session will also address the future of existing arms control arrangements and CSBMs, and may make recommendations.

Working session III: Early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, including the use of relevant OSCE tools (2 July 2008, 3–5.45 p.m.):

Working session III will afford an opportunity to exchange views on issues related to conflicts in the OSCE area, including co-operation with other international organizations. The session will assess the efficiency of existing OSCE mechanisms and procedures, and discuss whether there is a need for new measures in this regard.

Closing session (2 July 2008, 5.45–6.15 p.m.):

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

ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2008 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 1 and 2 July 2008

Background

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

Organization

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

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

The FSC contribution to the ASRC includes the chairing of the second session by a member of the FSC troika or the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre.

The Rules of Procedure of the OSCE will be followed, *mutatis mutandis*, at the Conference. Also, the Guidelines for Organizing OSCE Meetings (PC Decision No. 762) will be taken into account.

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

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

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

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

Participation

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

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

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

The international organizations that may be invited are the security-related organizations mentioned in Permanent Council Decision No. 807, of 1 November 2007.

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

General guidelines for participants

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

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

The aim is an interactive and free-flowing discussion.

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

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

By 6 June 2008, the participants in the Conference should inform the OSCE Secretariat of the composition of their delegations to the ASRC, in response to the information circular regarding organizational aspects of the Conference which will be sent out by the OSCE Secretariat.

By 20 June 2008, the participating States and other participants in the Conference are invited to submit any written contributions they may have, including those that contain reactions to the keynote speeches.

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

Guidelines for keynote speakers

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

The maximum available speaking time is 15 minutes per keynote speaker.

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

To enable delegations to prepare themselves, keynote speakers should provide a written contribution and their biographical synopsis to the CPC by 2 June 2008. In their presentations, keynote speakers should touch on the highlights of their written contribution.

Guidelines for moderators and rapporteurs

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

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

Personal views shall not be advanced.

Guidelines for the participation of other international organizations

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

International organizations should provide factual information, useful for the participants of the ASRC, to the CPC by 2 June 2008.

CHAIRPERSON'S PERCEPTION

The sixth Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC) allowed the participating States and other participants to take stock of the security situation in the OSCE area on the basis of the OSCE's comprehensive approach to security and offered a forum for a dialogue on topical security issues. The Conference also provided an opportunity to exchange views on current issues related to all arms control and confidence- and security-building measures in the OSCE area. To help focus the discussion, the agenda contained three themes: firstly, transnational challenges to security in the OSCE area; secondly, the present state of arms control arrangements, CSBMs and the Security Dialogue in the OSCE area; and thirdly, early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, including the use of relevant OSCE tools.

In his opening address, the Chairperson of the Permanent Council highlighted three subjects that the PC and FSC Chairs feel merit closer attention at this year's ASRC, namely the OSCE's engagement with Afghanistan, the state of the CFE Treaty and the settlement of protracted conflicts.

During the **Opening Session**, the participants engaged in a frank discussion on various issues that affect the current security situation in the OSCE area. Participating States were in agreement that terrorism and protracted conflicts are a continuous threat to security and stability in the OSCE area. It was mentioned that little progress had been made towards the peaceful settlement of protracted conflicts, in particular the Georgian-Abkhaz and the Georgian-Ossetian conflicts. There was a common understanding that the OSCE should continue its efforts on resolving protracted conflicts in its area, including making better use of existing conflict prevention mechanisms.

Delegations expressed their concern about the situation regarding the CFE Treaty/ Some Delegations referred to the temporarily suspension of implementation of the CFE Treaty by one State. In this context they called on this State to resume implementation. Also, the importance of working towards the ratification of the Adapted Treaty was stressed by Delegations. Finally, a proposal was made by one Delegation for the drafting of a new Treaty on European Security.

The main focus of **Working Session I** was on transnational challenges to security in the OSCE area, such as terrorism, illicit trafficking in drugs and weapons, and trafficking in human beings. The opinion was voiced that thematic mission, could be an important tool in addressing transnational threats to security. Also, there was agreement on the need for closer co-operation amongst international actors working in this field.

In session I, special emphasis was placed on OSCE Ministerial Council Decision No. 04/07 on OSCE engagement with Afghanistan. Discussions during this session revealed strong support for the work undertaken by the Secretary General to start implementation of this Decision. The Chairmanship took note of the fact that some Delegations look favorably on assessing the possibility of the OSCE involvement in Afghanistan. The issue of OSCE engagement with Afghanistan was also addressed by SACEUR General Craddock, on the second day of the Conference, who stressed that

the OSCE can play an important role in efforts aimed to secure and stabilize Afghanistan.

There was a common understanding that terrorism continued to be the major security threat in the OSCE area and that combating it should remain high on the agenda of the Organization. Also, Delegations agreed that the issue of combating trafficking in human beings should be taken into consideration in all OSCE cross-dimensional activities.

Working Session II assessed the current politico-military situation, and the value of the OSCE's security dialogue; its arms control arrangements and the CSBMs in the OSCE area. The discussion in this session revealed the continuous relevance of the CFE Treaty for European security, with several Delegations stressing the need for all State Parties to implement the Treaty.

There was a prevailing view that the participating States will need to make full use of the FSC potential to respond to current challenges and, if necessary to update and adapt existing OSCE Documents and tools. In this respect, a proposal for a Decision on Naval CSBMs was distributed by one of the participating States and the intention was expressed by another Delegation to table a Draft Decision on information exchange on cyber security.

Working Session III focused on the resolution of protracted conflicts as well as existing OSCE mechanisms and procedures for early warning, conflict prevention, and crisis management. In general, Delegations concurred that the unresolved conflicts in the OSCE area required more serious consideration toward their resolution. In particular, several crucial issues surfaced that warrant further examination, including proposals to establish new negotiation formats related to the Georgian-Abkhaz and the Georgian-Ossetian conflicts, and ways to increase efficiency of co-operation among International Organizations to facilitate conflict resolution.

Special attention was also given to the OSCE Mechanisms and Procedures related to early warning, conflict prevention, and crisis management. Delegations expressed positive remarks with regard to these Mechanisms and Procedures. In this regard it was proposed by one Delegation that the OSCE should be equipped with appropriate and effective rapid reaction/response tools.

The **Chair's overall perception** is that the 2008 ASRC provided sufficient substance for reflection and dialogue and that it offered a useful forum for participating States to express their concerns on security-related issues. The Conference also generated various recommendations and suggestions, which will be followed up in appropriate OSCE bodies. In particular, the Chairmanship will ensure follow-up by participating States on the proposals made by the Secretary General with regard to OSCE engagement with Afghanistan, taking into account the support expressed at the ASRC. The Chairmanship will also continue to seek ways to engage in a discussion with participating States on how to enhance OSCE efforts in resolving the protracted conflicts. Finally, Delegations are encouraged to carry their proposals forward by introducing them into the OSCE deliberation and decision-making process.

OPENING SESSION

- Opening address by: Ambassador Antti Turunen,
(and Moderator) Chairperson of the Permanent Council
- Report by: Ambassador Triin Parts,
Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation
- Rapporteur: Lieutenant Colonel Niels Poul Petersen,
Mission of Denmark to the OSCE, IAEA and CTBTO

At the opening session, the participants shared their views on the current security situation, highlighting the OSCE's role and its contribution to strengthening the security environment. They also emphasized the importance of the ASRC, being an essential forum which was offering for the sixth time a platform for dialogue and consultation involving all relevant actors.

In his opening remarks the Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council, Ambassador Turunen recognized that this year's ASRC took place in an interesting period for international affairs. Although the debate in the OSCE on a number of issues in the past year had been more intense than usual, confidence was expressed that common interests in the globalized world would encourage participating States to work closer together.

Ambassador Turunen underlined that this year's ARSC had an ambitious agenda: OSCE engagement with Afghanistan, the state of the CFE treaty and the settlement of protracted conflicts. However, these agenda items should not restrict participating States to raise any security issue for discussion.

It was emphasized that the ASRC is a joint event of the Permanent Council and the Forum for Security Co-operation and therefore an opportunity to deepen co-operation within the OSCE, just as the Finnish Chairmanship has sought to also intensify co-operation with other international organizations. Co-ordination and co-operation internally and externally is crucial to effectively address today's security challenges.

The Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation, Ambassador Parts, reported on the Forum's progress and activities with regard to the implementation of existing politico-military commitments and the discussions on new additional measures - such as the topic of cyber security.

The ASRC was reminded on the decision made at the 15th Ministerial Council in 2007, which expresses the desire to build on and strengthen the Forum's confidence and security building measures. Hope was expressed that this ministerial guidance would inspire the delegates and experts in their discussions at the ASRC.

Participants were also briefed on the various workshops, special meetings, conferences, and discussions on specific topics in which the FSC had been engaged in the course of the year.

Discussion

The first Delegation to take the floor pointed out that the most important challenges on the OSCE agenda include the protracted conflicts; sensitive arms control issues, and the growth of international terrorism. The OSCE should continue to concentrate on solving these real problems rather than paper efforts on internal “reforms”.

Regarding the issue of terrorism and the recently developed proposals to implement the OSCE’s Border Security and Management Concept in Afghanistan, this Delegation voiced the opinion that programs on the Afghan side of the border would have the greatest impact.

The Delegation encouraged the OSCE to intensify its focus on the protracted conflicts and be more actively engaged in their resolution. Concerning the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict, the peace plan proposed by the Georgian President, supported by the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, was considered a valuable step in the right direction. As for the Georgian-Ossetian conflict, support was expressed for additional OSCE monitors as well as joint Georgia-OSCE-Russia monitoring projects. The OSCE should also maintain its focus on Moldova and Azerbaijan and explore new solutions for the settlement of conflicts in these countries. Although OSCE accomplishments and new initiatives gave reason for optimism, the situation regarding the CFE Treaty gave reason for grave concern. The Delegation made an appeal to the state that had suspended the Treaty to immediately resume implementation and to continue working towards ratification of the adapted version of the Treaty on the basis of the Parallel Action Package supported by NATO Allies.

One State on behalf of a group of States urged the State that temporarily has suspended the implementation of the CFE Treaty to resume implementation. The same State was also urged to participate in the work on an agreement on the basis of the Parallel Actions Concept to preserve the benefits of the CFE regime. The Delegation supported in general terms the work on security issues carried out by the OSCE and mentioned in particular the politico-military dimension, which the group of States is actively committed to further enhance. Finally, regrets were expressed regarding the lack of progress towards a peaceful settlement of the protracted conflicts in Georgia.

One Delegation focused on what it referred to as the incomplete status of the process for reforming the OSCE, its institutions and its field operations. The Delegation favoured turning the OSCE into a fully fledged international organization whose tasks and goals must be reflected in a Charter for the Organization. According to the Delegation this is the only way the OSCE will become a genuinely democratic instrument for strengthening confidence and ensuring comprehensive security and stability in its area of responsibility.

Next, the Delegation focused on what it considers as an imbalance between the Organizations three “baskets” and argued that more emphasis must be put on politico-military issues such as arms control and confidence and security building measures, as they are some of the key elements to the future of the Organization. The Delegation saw the failure of the Adapted CFE Treaty as an apparent sign of lack of interest in such a development. Attention was called for what the Delegation described as an urgent need for developing and modernizing the arms control regimes and CSBMs, and the search for ways in which these might be adapted to the changed politico-military situation in the OSCE area.

Along the same lines as the previous speaker, one Delegation expressed its concern for the expansion of NATO and the building up of an anti-missile defence system close to its borders by another State, turning its territory into a strategic frontline.

The Delegation argued that in the absence of a comprehensive security architecture covering the OSCE area, the common and indivisible security space has been fragmented by numerous regional organizations that pursue their own agendas in the security area. This is contradictory to the Charter for European Security which says “ (...) no State, group of States or organization can have any pre-eminent responsibility for maintaining peace and stability in the OSCE area (...)”.

Against this background the Delegation referred to a recent initiative by its President calling for the drafting of a new legally binding document – a Treaty on European Security – and proposed the convening of an international forum of the highest level involving all the countries and the leading organisations of the Euro-Atlantic area.

The Delegation then turned to the issue of the unilateral proclamation of independence of Kosovo and saw this action by several states to have set an extremely dangerous precedent aspiring leaders of separatist movements in other parts of the world. The Delegation was of the opinion that in the case of Kosovo it was still not too late to return the situation to a legal framework.

Another State also followed the development in Kosovo with concern and stated the position that the unilateral declaration of independence by the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government in Pristina was an illegal act. This action was considered to violate principles of international law and to run directly counter to the Helsinki Final Act that gives clear guidance on territorial integrity and sovereignty and the inviolability of all OSCE participating States.

The Delegation appealed to all stakeholders to return to the negotiating table and to the principles of conflict-resolution, which are: dialogue, compromise and concord.

Taking a broad view of the Organization, one Delegation expressed its thoughts on what “joint action” has evolved into: Poor results may stem from different perceptions of reality among States. The Delegation referred to the use of the word “impasse” in connection with the CFE Treaty and the various protracted conflicts. The Delegation

argued that the reason for this “impasse” is lack of trust among States and the tendency to pursue national goals instead of engaging in co-operate actions. The fact that the OSCE has had no Summits since 1999 is a sign of a sickness within the Organization – participating States cannot agree on issues of real importance.

The Delegation described its Country as not being a member of any “money club”. It remains vulnerable to regional conflicts and depends on the OSCE regarding its security. The FSC has an important toolkit; however, it is not always implemented. The Delegation considered terrorism as the biggest problem within the OSCE.

Another Delegation stressed that the OSCE must face up to the challenges in its entire area and make full use of its wide range of instruments for conflict prevention, conflict resolution and its three dimensional concept of security. This Delegation, in addition to its support of OSCE’s work in general and the work with partner countries like Afghanistan in particular, mentioned a national initiative of setting standards for the use of Private Security Companies in conflict zones. The use of these companies and their often armed personnel are of concern to humanitarian organisations like the International Committee of the Red Cross. A total of 18 states are currently involved in the drafting of a “Good Practices” document, which is expected to be finalized in September 2008. The Delegation expressed its hope to get support for the initiative by other participating States in the OSCE as well as by the FSC.

Turning back to the protracted conflicts, one Delegation expressed its concern regarding the situation in Abkhazia, Georgia and in the Tskhinvali Region in South Ossetia, Georgia. Confidence had been lost in the current negotiations formats as the “main facilitator” of the peace process no longer was considered neutral and now appeared to pursue goals different from the peaceful solution of the conflicts. The same participating State had withdrawn from a sub-regional agreement that prohibits weapon transfers to the separatist regimes in the conflict areas. The Delegation proposed that a similar agreement or understanding between participating States could be formalized within the OSCE area.

The Delegation believed that the OSCE and other international organisations should significantly increase their role in the conflict resolution process. Attention was drawn to the suggested 2+2+2 format that envisaged meetings between the groups involved in the conflict and international organizations. Confidence was expressed that this format could give a fresh impulse to the peaceful settlement of the conflict.

With regard to the CFE Treaty, the Delegation expressed its serious concern with the decision by one State to suspend its participation in the Treaty. Interest was declared in the full implementation of the Istanbul Commitments, especially regarding host Country consent of the stationing of foreign forces on its territory, and the entry into force of the Adapted CFE Treaty.

Another Delegation expressed similar views on the CFE Treaty and spoke also on the conflicts in Georgia, where the parties were urged to show restraint in their military

actions and engage in peaceful negotiations with one another. The Delegation expressed its support to the work carried out by the OSCE and urged the participating States to meet the needs of the Afghan people as expeditiously as possible.

One State on behalf of a group of States also expressed its security concerns linked with the protracted conflicts in Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldova. The State stressed that refugees and internally displaced persons should return to their homes and the entire population in the conflict affected territories should benefit from significant autonomy in accordance with international law, UN regulations and OSCE decisions. Also stressed was the necessity of complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of these states.

Recommendations and suggestions

A number of proposals and recommendations were made at the opening session, and several speakers announced their intentions of further discussing these subjects in the working sessions:

- OSCE should continue to concentrate on solving real problems rather than paper efforts on internal “reforms”;
 - OSCE should intensify its focus on separatist conflicts and be more actively engaged in their resolution;
 - OSCE should be turned into a fully fledged international organization whose tasks and goals must be reflected in a Charter for the Organization;
 - OSCE should participate in the drafting of a new Treaty on European Security (with reference to the Platform for Co-operative Security);
 - The OSCE should participate in a high-level international forum to conduct a substantive dialogue on security issues aimed at reaching specific understandings;
 - Clear and systematic principles for conflict settlement should be devised, which are observed by all participating States and that must be applied to all conflicts in the OSCE area;
 - Participating States should agree on setting standards for the use of Private Security Companies in conflict zones;
 - Participating States should reach common understanding on the inadmissibility of weapon transfers to separatist regimes in conflict areas.
-

WORKING SESSION I

Transnational Threats to Security in the OSCE Area

- Keynote Speakers: Ambassador Pierre Morel, the EU Special Representative for Central Asia
- Dr. Wolfgang Zellner, Head of CORE (Centre for OSCE Research)
- Moderator: Ambassador György Molnár, Permanent Representative of Hungary to the OSCE
- Rapporteur: Mr. Andranik Hovhannisyan, Delegation of the Republic of Armenia to the OSCE

The main focus of the first session of the Annual Security Review Conference was on transnational challenges to security in the OSCE area, such as terrorism, illicit trafficking in drugs and weapons, and trafficking in human beings. A special emphasis was put on the implementation of OSCE Ministerial Council Decision No. 4/07 on OSCE engagement with Afghanistan.

The first keynote speaker, Ambassador Morel mainly concentrated in his presentation on transnational threats faced by Central Asian States, their impact on the OSCE area and the response of the EU and the OSCE to these challenges. He pointed out that the geographic location of Central Asia as a transit-region makes the area vulnerable to such kind of threats as trafficking in drugs and weapons and trafficking in human beings that arise in parallel with extremist and terrorist activities. The security situation was being exacerbated by the weakness of State institutions and the extensive proliferation of fundamentalist and radical propaganda in certain parts of Central Asia. Ambassador Morel noted that EU's efforts in Central Asia were aimed at strengthening internal stability and border control. This policy was conducted through the EU Strategy for Central Asia adopted in 2007, which comprises bilateral and regional projects in a wide range of areas, including rule of law, education, water resources management, and energy security. Furthermore, the EU Member States prepared a series of international events specifically designed to address the security situation in Central Asia. Ambassador Morel underlined the importance of co-operation with other international actors, stressing that the OSCE was a privileged partner of the EU in the part of the world in question. He underlined that it was high time for both organizations to move on from mutual political support to practical co-operation in the field.

The second keynote speaker, Dr. Zellner underscored transnational challenges as one of the main threats to security and stability in the OSCE area, also mentioning that the OSCE had produced excellent policy documents on the subject. However, the Organization's activities were merely of a declaratory and symbolic nature: concrete tools for tackling transnational challenges were still significantly underdeveloped. He

therefore called on the OSCE to reinvent itself and to adapt its working instruments. Dr. Zellner advocated that consideration should be given to the following issues and dilemmas typically connected with transnational threats and challenges: the complexity and multi-dimensionality of the challenges; their invisible and non-public nature; the anonymity of the actors involved; the lack of co-ordination with other international organizations in this field; the dilemma of weak States and conflicts; and the lack of adequate policy-responses to these challenges. Finally, he concluded that international disagreement on military-political issues had a negative impact on the decision-making process in the field of addressing global risks and threats. Dr. Zellner proposed that the OSCE take four concrete steps in order to address transnational threats. Firstly, participating States should consider reviving the topic of thematic missions. Secondly, existing thematic units should be upgraded and integrated in a single department. Thirdly, the OSCE agenda should be streamlined and focused on long-term efforts. Fourthly, in order to confront transnational challenges more effectively, Central Asia should be made a strategic priority.

Discussion

The keynote speeches were followed by extensive discussion, in the course of which conference participants touched upon a wide range of security-related issues. Several Delegations agreed with the keynote speaker that thematic missions could play an important role in addressing transnational challenges. One delegation argued that thematic missions could deal with specific problems in all OSCE participating States and propose possible alternative solutions to raising problems. Another Delegation emphasized that the OSCE Border Security and Management Concept was an important tool in combating transnational threats. However, it was noted that border control could not be viewed as a singular solution to all such challenges. Speaking about weak States, the same delegation pointed out the absence of a model designed to create mature and strong States and the lack of any kind of mechanism to compress long-standing achievements of certain regions in other regions in a course of limited period of time.

One Delegation drew the attention of the conference participants to the following matters as areas of special concern: the unpredictable nature of new risks, the ineffectiveness of existing preventive toolkits, and the growing aggressiveness of criminal elements. A representative of the executive secretariat of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) highlighted the contribution of his organization in the areas of peacekeeping and addressing transnational challenges, emphasizing the significance of a coordinated approach. The importance of having universal norms and standards for security at national and international levels was also stressed, with particular emphasis being put on the central role of the United Nations as a core organization regulating international relations. Another Delegation agreed that the UN had a special role in this regard, adding that the OSCE provided a basis for setting up national efforts. The Delegation's presentation focused on the activities of a given State in addressing transnational challenges. Some other Delegations also presented their national efforts in addressing transnational threats to security.

Several speakers underlined the need to improve co-operation between the relevant international and regional actors in Central Asia, to avoid duplication, and likewise the need for all institutions and organizations involved to have their own particular added value to contribute. One Delegation argued that there is enough work to do for all. It was mentioned that the EU's activities in Central Asia in countering transnational

threats were very similar to the OSCE's efforts in this field, and that the two organizations should co-operate closely. The special role played by the OSCE field missions with their particular degree of experience was praised.

Several Delegations highlighted the role of OSCE Ministerial Council Decision No. 04/07 as a valuable basis for the Organization's engagement with Afghanistan, commending the efforts of the OSCE Secretary General to generate a package of projects, which one delegation called an important step in the right direction. The same Delegation added that the OSCE involvement must take place with the consent of host Countries, and be based on a realistic assessment of their capabilities.

Some Delegations were in favor of assessing the possibility of the OSCE involvement in Afghanistan. One Delegation viewed the OSCE engagement with Afghanistan as an additional instrument at the disposal of the international community for the promotion of further direct assistance to Afghanistan, complementing bilateral efforts. One Delegation called upon the OSCE participating States to better think through the distinction between the OSCE engagement in Afghanistan and the OSCE engagement with Afghanistan; whose capacity the Organization was going to improve; and did the OSCE possess sufficient capability to do it? Several speakers emphasized the impact that the situation around Afghanistan had on the entire OSCE area.

Illicit trafficking in drugs from Afghanistan was identified as a special area of concern. One Delegation gave credit to Ministerial Council Decision No. 04/07 for providing a basis on which the OSCE might build its counter-narcotic activities related to Afghanistan. A representative of a field mission stated that his Field Operation has the capacity to contribute to the implementation of Ministerial Council Decision No. 04/07, especially in the fields of border control and the combating of illicit drug-trafficking, and that it stood ready to assist. At this juncture, the proposed establishment of a Border Academy was stressed as a priority for that particular field mission.

The representative of the CSTO called upon the OSCE to become more involved in the activities undertaken by his Organization in combating terrorism, extremism, and trafficking.

Another intervention focused on trafficking in human beings. It was stated that a growing threat of trafficking in human beings feed organized crime, corruption, and enhanced radicalization of groups, undermining the safety and security of whole societies. Thus, human insecurity was definitely interlinked with State insecurity and as a political topic it should be tackled in a more practical way by being included in all OSCE cross-dimensional activities.

Several Delegations drew attention to the OSCE's political contribution to the fight against terrorism. One delegation highlighted the rich list of OSCE documents in this regard, which constituted a solid ground for activities such as those conducted throughout the previous year. It was stressed that the Organization should continue to make its anti-terrorist activities a priority. The same Delegation praised the OSCE for playing effectively its role as a "transmitter" of United Nations decisions in the pan-European environment which helps the Organization to continue to maintain its rightful place in the worldwide division of labour, including its counter-terrorism aspects. In this regard efforts by the OSCE to build Private-Public Partnerships in

countering terrorism were positively highlighted and it was also mentioned that existing work with regard to terrorism and the Internet should be continued. Another Delegation pointed to the cross-dimensional nature of the fight against terrorism and praised the OSCE Chairmanship's current focus on human rights and rule of law while addressing that issue. The same Delegation strongly argued for a consolidated approach condemning terrorism in all its forms and manifestations without prejudice to its origins and motivations.

Recommendations and suggestions

The following suggestions and recommendations were made by participants of the Conference in Working Session I:

- The topic of thematic missions should be revived as an instrument for addressing transnational challenges in all OSCE Participating States and to propose possible alternative ways of solving them;
 - To revitalize OSCE tools in addressing transnational challenges;
 - To explore the possibility of providing assistance to Afghanistan in conducting parliamentary and presidential elections scheduled for 2009 and 2010;
 - To explore the possibility of enhanced involvement of Afghanistan in OSCE projects in Central Asia;
 - Co-operation between international organizations active in the field of addressing transnational challenges should be strengthened, as should a co-operative approach generally;
 - Central Asia should be made a priority region for the OSCE in addressing transnational challenges;
 - The issue of trafficking in human beings should be included in all relevant OSCE cross-dimensional activities;
 - The OSCE should continue its activities on combating terrorism on the internet.
-

ADDRESS BY GENERAL CRADDOCK SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER EUROPE

Special Guest: SACEUR, General John Craddock

Moderator: Dr. Pauli Järvenpää, Director General, Ministry of Defence of Finland

Note Takers: Mr. John Crosby, Operational Support Officer, CPC

Mr. Erik Falkehed, Analyst/Researcher, CPC

In his speech to the Annual Security Review Conference, General Craddock, NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (SACEUR), focused on the situation in Afghanistan and the challenges the international community face in the country.

General Craddock reminded the participants that NATO is involved in Afghanistan, and elsewhere, in its role as a transatlantic security provider. The UN mandated International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) remains NATO's operational priority. Currently NATO has more than 52,000 servicemen and women from 40 NATO and non-NATO partner countries on the ground in Afghanistan. General Craddock underlined that progress was made in Afghanistan – albeit uneven progress – as the situation remains very challenging. In regard to the security situation in the country, he pointed out that 70% of the security incidents in 2007 occurred in only 10% - or 40 – of the 396 districts in Afghanistan.

General Craddock stressed that the international community - UN, NATO, EU, OSCE - can and must do more in Afghanistan. In this regard he noted that it is important to remember that NATO's action in Afghanistan is just part of a comprehensive approach by the greater international community and that “no organization can achieve success on its own”. Co-operation and long-term commitment were said to be essential to enduring progress.

General Craddock stated that the OSCE can play an important role in the campaign to secure and stabilize Afghanistan. A central need for the Afghanistan government is training, in order to enable it to provide for its own security and provide governance of - and for - its citizens. Development of the Afghan national police force was mentioned by General Craddock as an area where the OSCE could have “a tremendous impact”. Proposals from the OSCE to improve the national law enforcement capability and increase border co-operation in Afghanistan were also welcomed by the SACEUR.

Discussion

One Delegation viewed SACEUR's input an important part of the dialogue as, in the past, the OSCE and NATO have proven to be complementary institutions bringing their respective fields of expertise together to reach common goals. Furthermore, it was said that after three decades of conflict, the international community has a moral obligation

to help Afghanistan rebuild. The same Delegation also pointed out that OSCE support to previous elections in Afghanistan demonstrated what the OSCE can do to assist by drawing on niche capacities.

Another Delegation advocated an increase in support to Afghanistan where the UN has a leading role to play. The OSCE was said to have an important part to play in such an increased engagement. The project package presented by the Secretary General was a good start and the Delegation hoped that a decision could be reached on it prior to the summer recess. The Delegation expressed hope that the elections in Afghanistan in 2009 would be free and fair and that the OSCE could provide support to this event.

One Delegation noted that the interests of many countries and international organisations come together in Afghanistan as developments there have negative effects on all. To fight organized crime, drug smuggling, terrorism and religious extremism were identified as priorities. The Delegation advocated that the OSCE should assist in setting up security belts around Afghanistan, and that the OSCE should engage with CSTO in this respect; however, duplication should be avoided. Furthermore, the Delegation recommended that all extra-budgetary projects in Afghanistan should be under the control of the Permanent Council.

General Craddock concluded his address stating that his three main concerns regarding Afghanistan currently were: governance (progress has been slowed and is uneven as momentum needs to be regained); narcotics (it fuels insurgency and corruption); and changing conditions in Pakistan (following recent elections, there is a need to see what happens in border regions, where there has been an increase in violent action).

WORKING SESSION II

The present state of arms control arrangements, CSBMs and the Security Dialogue in the OSCE area

Keynote Speakers: Ambassador Alyson Bailes, Visiting Professor, Iceland University

Ambassador Adam Kobieracki, Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Moderator: Ambassador Sánchez de Boado y de la Válgoma, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE

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

The main focus of the session was on issues concerning the implementation of the CFE (Conventional Armed Forces in Europe) Treaty and on its repercussions on the state of discussions in the first dimension in its entirety. New and emerging threats and the possible role of the OSCE in facing them were also mentioned, as well as the importance of recognizing the value of the OSCE *acquis* and of building upon it to revive the Forum of Security Co-operation (FSC) and the Organization as a whole.

Ambassador Bailes noted that although the broader Europe still counts as a relatively happy family – by global standards - there are some spots of unhappiness, such as the current CFE situation, the developments in Kosovo, and disputes linked with the strategic implications of the development of ballistic missile defence programmes and other basing plans in Europe. Ambassador Bailes identified two underlying causes that produce symptoms of misunderstanding and mistrust within the OSCE region. Firstly, the enlargement of the European Union and NATO, and secondly, the fact that NATO and the EU have globalized their security agendas, and several Western Countries have shifted their focus rather fast towards military actions on a large scale outside the OSCE area. The keynote speaker pointed out that if the diverging strategies of powers and institutions for dealing with new threats start cracking the foundations of European stability itself, we shall not only risk destroying the happy example of peace and reconciliation, but also weakening the very ground we stand on for engaging in wider activities. The great OSCE idea is about states, both individually and collectively, *taking responsibility* for security and for other people' security interests as well as their own. Unhappiness, according to Ambassador Bailes, arises from moving away from that principle, and the way to happiness lies in somehow opening a road for us to move back together towards it.

Ambassador Kobieracki carefully analysed the current crisis of the CFE regime, arguing that any assessment of the causes and the consequences of this crisis must take into account its links with other CSBMs and the Open Skies Treaty in the overall OSCE

framework of comprehensive European security. It has to be acknowledged that new politico-military realities are surrounding the CFE Treaty today, rendering the old notion of “balance of conventional armed forces” obsolete. Ambassador Kobieracki offered two ways ahead for the CFE Treaty, namely the selective renegotiation of both the original CFE and the Agreement on Adaptation; or the tackling of current concerns by State parties as part of a process leading to the ratification and subsequent entry into force of the Agreement on Adaptation. The main goal should be the preservation and possibly reinforcement of conventional arms control in Europe in order to avoid the gradual erosion of trust, openness, confidence and transparency: the longer the CFE deadlock lasts, the higher the chance of a violation of the Treaty provisions and/or limits becomes. Should such a scenario occur, the current crisis might therefore become irreversible.

Discussion

A number of Delegations took the floor, contributing to a lively debate. Many among them did so to discuss the crisis of the CFE Treaty. Several Delegations highlighted the heritage of stability, transparency and predictability owed to the CFE regime and the importance of preserving it. One Delegation argued that the CFE Treaty in its original form has lost all relevance to reality, and that it is willing to engage in a dialogue with a view to finding a way out of the impasse that has arisen. It further stated that if the CFE Treaty crisis is to be overcome, more active use needs to be made of the opportunities afforded by the Vienna negotiation platform. One Delegation questioned the legal basis of the suspension of implementation of the CFE by one State party, urging it to withdraw its decision and to favourably consider the offers made by NATO under the “parallel action package”. Several other Delegations also urged the one State to resume implementation of the Treaty. Another Delegation highlighted the strong support given by NATO to the present CFE regime, including its provisions concerning the flanks, and stressed its belief that the entry into force of the Adapted Treaty would not be the final phase for the CFE negotiations, but an opportunity to engage in an exercise during which all provisions of the Treaty itself could be invoked and reviewed.

Many Delegations also raised the issue of broader OSCE Commitments in the politico-military dimension and the need for an enhanced role of the FSC, underlining the importance of implementing and building up on existing Documents and Decisions. One Delegation argued for increased involvement of the OSCE in reinforcing cyber security in Europe, thus protecting participating States from threats to their public and private sectors, and urging participating States to sign and accede to the relevant Council of Europe Convention as well as to consider the proposal for a Draft Decision on information exchange on cyber security that is to be tabled in the FSC.

One Delegation argued that a secure future is possible only by overcoming differences and problems through co-operation and confidence building and highlighted, to this end, the importance of sub-regional agreements, such as that established by the Article IV of Annex 1B to the Dayton Peace Accord.

One Delegation argued that the rise in asymmetric threats had rendered the OSCE arms control *acquis* not useless but more necessary than ever, nevertheless adding that any “update” of existing CSBMs and arms control arrangements must be preceded by a thorough review and discussion on existing commitments. Another Delegation advocated a combined approach to CSBMs by improving the implementation of already

agreed measures on one hand, and adapting existing or developing new OSCE instruments on the other hand to better reflect the challenges posed by the new security environment in Europe. Another Delegation urged the participating States to make full use of the FSC potential to respond to current challenges and to update and adapt existing OSCE Documents and tools. Finally, one Delegation drew the participant's attention to a Draft Decision on naval CSBMs it had just circulated, suggesting to begin discussions on these proposals in the FSC by the end of the month.

Recommendations and suggestions

As suggestions and recommendations for further consideration, the Working Session II therefore offered:

- Proposal for a Draft Decision (to be circulated after the ASRC) on information exchange on cyber security;
 - Food for Thought and a Draft Decision (already circulated during the ASRC) on confidence- and security- building measures in the naval area;
 - Suggestion for a comprehensive review of existing CSBMs and arms control arrangements in order to adapt the OSCE tools to new and asymmetric threats;
 - Proposal to use the "parallel action package" approved by NATO as the basis for negotiations possibly leading to ratification and entry into force of the Agreement on Adaptation of the CFE;
 - Proposal to organize a second Special FSC Meeting on "Prospect for Arms Control and CSBMs in the OSCE area";
 - Suggestion to improve the OSCE Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security;
 - Suggestion to improve the use of the AIAM as an interactive forum for thorough assessment of politico-military issues.
-

WORKING SESSION III

Early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, including the use of the relevant OSCE tools

Keynote Speakers: Ambassador Heikki Talvitie, Special Envoy of the Chairman-in-Office

Dr. Arie Bloed, Editor-in-Chief of “Security and Human Rights” (formerly “Helsinki Monitor”)

Moderator: Ambassador Herbert Salber, Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre

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

The moderator, Ambassador Herbert Salber, referred in his brief introductory remarks to the Compendium of OSCE Mechanisms and Procedures (SEC.GAL/121/08) and the Summary of OSCE Mechanisms and Procedures (SEC.GAL/120/08) which were compiled and distributed in order to prepare and facilitate the discussion in Working Session III.

The first keynote speaker, Ambassador Heikki Talvitie, stated that conflict prevention, crisis management and conflict settlement were matters of central importance for the current Finnish OSCE Chairmanship. The CiO would therefore make every effort to ensure that progress was made including by using the Quintet format, which could be further developed with regard to conflict resolution efforts. In this context he appealed to all parties involved to demonstrate strong political will and multilateral political engagement.

Ambassador Talvitie then informed about the state of play regarding the protracted conflicts in the OSCE area. On the Transnistrian settlement (Moldova), he felt that concrete results in CBMs, in particular in the working group, would pave the way to restarting the political 5+2 negotiations on status-related issues. Regarding South Ossetia, Georgia he voiced the CiO's readiness to explore possibilities for a new negotiating format acceptable to the parties to the conflict. He highlighted the Economic Rehabilitation Programme which was supported by all major parties. Although the UN had the lead in the conflict settlement in Abkhazia, Georgia he explicitly mentioned the recent activation of the Vienna Document 1999 mechanism in the OSCE framework. Regarding Nagorno-Karabakh, Ambassador Talvitie encouraged Armenia and Azerbaijan to make full use of the services offered by the Minsk Group Co-Chairs and to give serious consideration to the proposal containing basic principles for resolving the conflict. On behalf of the Minsk Group, Ambassador Fassier gave an update on the situation regarding Nagorno-Karabakh.

The second keynote speaker, Dr. Arie Bloed, welcomed the fact, that the OSCE's mechanisms and procedures for had recently been rediscovered and applied. He then examined whether existing mechanisms were still or again useful tools to achieve the OSCE's main aim of early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and peaceful settlement of disputes and whether changes were needed. While doing so, he stated that the recent use of largely forgotten mechanisms is an indication that the OSCE's permanent bodies and structures apparently do no longer sufficiently provide effective tools for dialogue. Besides he noted that only a few OSCE mechanisms were actually being used.

Dr. Bloed recommended to enhancing at least the knowledge about the existence and the potential usefulness of OSCE mechanisms, both in Vienna and in the OSCE participating States. In this context he also suggested to pay more attention to those mechanisms in the OSCE's toolkit which were based on the principles of *Consensus Minus One* or *Consensus Minus Two*.

In concluding his keynote presentation, Dr. Bloed voiced his personal view that it was not necessary to significantly change or complement the existing toolkit on mechanisms since the available tools allowed for a great flexibility and could be tailored for particular cases. Instead he suggested to revitalizing the OSCE's consultation bodies and making their work more flexible.

Discussion

A total of 14 delegations contributed to the following discussion. Many of them commented on the relevance of OSCE mechanisms for conflict settlement. Others touched upon specific protracted conflicts in the OSCE area.

The first delegation which took the floor, and who represented a group of States, stated that some of the GUAM Member States were affected by unresolved conflicts. The State indicated that the GUAM had demonstrated that it was an effective instrument to increase awareness of the international community about risks and challenges that its Members States were facing. Attention was drawn to the joint GUAM position on conflict settlement which was based on the full and unequivocal respect for international law. International co-operation was needed to strengthen the international law system. On the other hand, an ambiguous reaction of the international community to secessionist or irredentist claims would, among others, generate mutual suspicion and mistrust. Finally, brief information was given about the recently adopted "Basic principles for the settlement of the conflicts on the territories of the GUAM States".

One Delegation stated that the Transnistrian conflict was considered less complex and therefore easier to solve compared to other conflicts, provided that all parties involved demonstrated adequate political will. It highlighted a new settlement strategy proposed by the Republic of Moldova which could open a new prospect for a lasting settlement. This strategy was based on three pillars: a package of political, economic, social and humanitarian elements, negotiations in the "5 plus 2" format and Confidence and Security Building Measures. The same delegation therefore welcomed the efforts undertaken by the OSCE Chairmanship aimed at the resumption of full-fledged negotiations in the "5 plus 2" format. It appreciated the increased engagement of the EU in the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy, and the positive role of Ukraine as well as the consequent support by the USA. It counted on the Russian

Federation to positively influence the situation in the region. The support of the OSCE Mission to Moldova was also important. The same delegation proposed to organize an international donor conference aimed at creating a post-conflict development fund for Moldova.

One delegation drew the attention of the Conference to the growing tendency of selective perception of the 10 principles of the Helsinki Final Act which do not all evolve, exist and perch on top of a pin of only one of those principles, namely territorial integrity.

The next delegation drew a number of conclusions for the OSCE of recent incidents in conflict areas. To be relevant, the OSCE should be able to respond quickly. It should also use its major assets, such as the expertise by both PC and FSC, and the existence of agreed and established mechanisms for crises or emergencies. The OSCE was important since it provided the platform for a political dialogue in the context of commitments to values. Finally, the role of the CiO as the Organization's crisis management was highlighted.

Another delegation mentioned outdated and inefficient formats of the peace process related to the Georgian-Abkhaz and Georgian-Ossetian conflicts as well as recent steps taken by Russia as the main reasons for the continued deterioration of the situation in both conflict regions. Urgent and decisive actions were needed in order to turn the process towards stabilization and reintegration. In this context it elaborated on the peace proposals which were presented by Georgia. The first and foremost task was to achieve a de-escalation of tensions on the ground. In this regard the OSCE should contribute to facilitate negotiations with Russia to withdraw its military forces from Abkhazia, Georgia, stop the construction of military infrastructure and reverse the Presidential decree that established official ties between Russia and Abkhazia, Georgia and South Ossetia, Georgia. Main elements of a new strategy to resolve the conflicts could be the establishment of new negotiating formats with the participation of OSCE and the EU, the provision of security guarantees on the ground, including by using the OSCE and the EU to develop internationally guaranteed policing arrangements on the ground as well as other measures. While the EU and the UN should have the lead regarding Abkhazia, the role of the OSCE should be reinforced with respect to South Ossetia.

The next delegation recalled the basic principles for regional conflict resolution. While some OSCE mechanisms were outdated, others should be used in a wise manner. Commenting on the settlement of the conflicts in the Caucasus, it stated that the sole obstacle to progress was the absence of political will on the part of one of the parties. Regarding Abkhazia, Georgia, it demanded a clear-cut specialization between International Organizations in order to avoid a duplication of mediation services. Georgia could contribute to a positive resolution of the conflict in Abkhazia by signing an agreement on the non-use of force and on security guarantees as well as by withdrawing all its armed formations from the upper part of the Kodori without any conditions. Regarding South Ossetia it was proposed that the OSCE Mission to Georgia should adopt a more active and resolute position with the aim of an urgent resumption of normal work by the Joint Control Commission. The first step might be a meeting, for examples in Moscow, of the Commission's co-chairmen in order to identify key measures aimed at reducing tension and restoring confidence in the region. With the

assistance of the OSCE, an appropriate agreement on the non-resumption of military activities should be concluded.

According to another delegation the OSCE should employ all its comparative advantages in close co-ordination and interoperability with other international actors. This would include pooling efforts to facilitate negotiations, using OSCE's monitoring and confidence building capacities, reinforcing OSCE engagement in crises situations and using the Economic Rehabilitation Programme in South Ossetia, Georgia as a model.

One Delegation underlined that through its available mechanisms the OSCE was able to respond quickly to crises and bring the parties together in dialogue. These mechanisms should be used in a timely and coherent manner. It was proposed to continue reviewing which mechanisms were still relevant and which might be in need of updating. This review might also draw lessons from the way in which OSCE mechanisms have up to now been applied. In general, opportunities afforded by the OSCE with regard to conflicts should be expanded and intensively used, in close co-operation with other international players and on the basis of political support by the participating States.

Another Delegation noted a lack of efficiency and responsiveness which impacted on the proper functioning of OSCE mechanisms. Concerning the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, it regretted that 16 years of OSCE mediation had not brought any progress towards a peaceful settlement. The organization should therefore revise its approach to deal with this conflict. A solution to the conflict could only be achieved on the basis of respect for the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

One delegation named political dialogue and confidence building as keys to ease tensions between conflicting parties. The OSCE with its broad participation and field missions as well as with its special expertise in confidence building and conflict prevention was best placed to contribute effectively to conflict resolution.

Another delegation encouraged the OSCE to further strengthen its co-operation and co-ordination with other international organizations with regard to their activities towards promoting a secure and stable environment, particularly in the zone of conflicts.

Suggestions and recommendations

During Working Session III the following suggestions and recommendations concerning the OSCE's capability with regard to conflicts should be noted as being particularly worthy of further consideration:

- Knowledge about OSCE mechanisms, including those which are not based on the *Consensus Principle*, should be enhanced;
 - The OSCE's capacity to respond quickly in crises situations should be actively used, including by using the expertise of both the PC and FSC as well as by providing a platform for political dialogue;
 - The OSCE should be equipped with appropriate and effective rapid reaction/response tools, such as capability to summon required experts from its States for timely dispatching on the ground;
-

- Confidence building measures, such as the Economic Rehabilitation Programme in South Ossetia, Georgia, should be applied to ease tensions and restore trust between conflicting parties;
 - Close co-operation with other international players as well as political support by the participating States were essential for an effective functioning of OSCE's mechanisms;
 - The review of mechanisms regarding their relevance and practical applicability should be continued. This review might also draw lessons from the way in which OSCE mechanisms have up to now been applied.
-

CLOSING SESSION

Chairperson: Mr. Vesa Vasara, Deputy Permanent Representative of Finland to the OSCE

Speakers: Lieutenant Colonel Niels Poul Petersen
Mission of Denmark to the OSCE, IAEA and CTBTO
(Rapporteur Opening Session)

Mr. Andranik Hovhannisyan, Delegation of the Republic of Armenia to the OSCE (Rapporteur Working Session 1)

Mr. Valerio Negro, Permanent Mission of Italy to the OSCE
(Rapporteur Working Session 2)

Mr. Jan Kantorczyk, Permanent Mission of Germany to the OSCE (Rapporteur Working Session 3)

The Deputy Permanent Representative of Finland to the OSCE, and representative of the OSCE Chairmanship, Mr. Vesa Vasara, concluded the ASRC, which had allowed its participants to take a fresh look on the current security situation in Europe.

Following a brief introduction of the session, the rapporteurs of the opening and working sessions provided a concise overview of the discussions that took place over the last two days. In their presentations, the rapporteurs outlined the main points of the discussions and referred to their written reports for a more detailed overview of the sessions, including a list of recommendations and suggestions.

Subsequently, the Chairperson highlighted several issues that were discussed during the Conference, which may also be relevant in the run up to the Helsinki Ministerial Council.

- There was a strong support for the implementation of the Madrid Ministerial Council Decision on the OSCE engagement with Afghanistan. It was felt that the OSCE can bring value added and complement other international efforts by investing in border security and management. This needs to be done in close co-operation with other relevant organizations.
 - The reflections on the current state of the CFE Treaty showed the continued relevance of the Treaty. The politico-military commitments and their full implementation were considered to be a central element of the OSCE *acquis*.
 - The protracted conflicts were regarded as a priority area for the OSCE action. It is clear that we need to mobilize sustained political will of both the parties and the international community to promote the peaceful resolution of the protracted conflicts.
-

In closing, the Chairperson thanked the speakers for their contribution and the members of Delegations for their active participation. The participants were informed that the ideas and proposals that had been discussed at the ASRC will be further discussed in the appropriate OSCE bodies according to their mandates.