

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

30th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum

"Promoting security and stability in the OSCE area through sustainable economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic"

CONCLUDING MEETING Prague, 8-9 September 2022

Remarks of Ambassador Igli Hasani Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

On the role of the Economic and Environmental Forum in advancing dialogue and co-operation in the second dimension

Thank you Ambassador Djundev, Dear Igor, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for being with us today.

Let me start out by expressing my appreciation to the Polish OSCE Chairmanship for introducing this session in the agenda of this EEF concluding meeting and for the kind invitation.

I am very pleased to contribute to the discussion, which is more than timely and necessary.

Typically, anniversaries are a time for reflection on accomplishments and shortcoming as well as an opportunity to chart the way forward.

Going through the piles of documents and papers produced by the OSCE over the years, I found out that the last strategic debate about the future orientation of the Economic and Environmental Dimension took place between 2008 and 2010.

More than a decade ago, under the able guidance of successive OSCE Chairmanship, the OSCE participating States embarked upon an informal reflection process with the aim to improve further the work of our organization in the Second Dimension.

That engagement was truly meaningful and bore fruit.

Here I wish to mention the 2009 Chairmanship report on the future orientation of the EED, prepared by the Dutch diplomat Alexander Verbeek who presided over an informal group of friends convened for that occasion.

The report formulated 15 concrete recommendations designed to lead to a more visible and substantial role for this dimension, within the OSCE's comprehensive concept of security, by streamlining and improving the effectiveness of our activities in the Economic and Environmental Dimension.

Thankfully, the result of those deliberations was not yet another OSCE report, shelved with honors in the Delegates Dashboard soon after its publications.

Participating States worked diligently and demonstrated political will to enact successfully some of the recommendations contained therein.

Let me recall here a few of the key achievements:

- the synchronization of the annual cycle of work in the EED with the Chairmanship's year;
- the streamlining of the structure of the Economic and Environmental process through the adoption of a relevant PC decision (958/2011), and;
- the establishment of the annual Economic and Environmental Dimension Implementation Meeting.

The EED that we know today is largely the result of those productive deliberations.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Colleagues,

I think everyone will agree with me that more than a dozen years later, the OSCE region is living through its worse security crisis. The European security architecture – our common security – is in shambles.

In the face of unprecedented adversities, yet another anniversary is around the corner - the 50th birthday of the Helsinki Final Act.

With this in mind, perhaps time is ripe to promote and encourage a debate on the overall role of the second dimension in achieving comprehensive security in the OSCE region.

Obviously, this is a prerogative of the incoming OSCE Chairmanships, based on their national priorities and the views expressed by all other participating States.

But let us not miss this opportunity here in Prague, and maybe in the coming two years, to take a closer look at what we are doing in the second dimension, to assess the effectiveness of the second dimension toolkit and reflect on its future orientation.

Challenges are abundant and the issues to discuss plentiful.

I will focus briefly on the cornerstones of the second dimension and share with you a few thoughts on the areas that in my view deserve particular attention.

First, the 2003 Maastricht Strategy for the Economic and Environmental Dimension, which remains the basic framework for the OSCE in this domain. It continues to provide strategic

guidance to the participating States and the OSCE executive structures for planning and implementing their activities in the EED.

There is no doubt that this document has served us well throughout the years. Nevertheless, we must acknowledge the fact that the realities we face today in the second dimension, 20 years after its adoption, have change markedly.

While a thorough update of the document is virtually impossible in the current political situation, our attention could focus on its effective implementation. At this stage, a regular process that monitors and assesses progress achieved in its implementation could be explored.

Second, the office of the CoEEA has a solid mandate designed to support the ability of the Permanent council and the participating States to address economic, environmental and social challenges to security.

The Office boasts also a respectable record of accomplishment support participating States to meet their OSCE commitments.

In line with our mandate and in consultation with you, we are ready and willing to expand the scope of our activities on key economic and environmental issues of security concern, provided that sufficient resources are allocated.

I am not referring to extra budgetary resources, which have peaked recently, but to the budgetary ones that are directly pegged to the programme outline process.

Additional budgetary resources could serve to build up early warning and analytical capacities to respond to emerging crisis and foster regional co-operation projects. This would beef up our preventive role and ability to support the participating States in addressing threats in the second dimension.

Third, the functioning of our main political dialogue for ain the second dimension, namely the EEF and the EEC.

A lot of progress has been achieved in ensuring continuity of priorities between succeeding OSCE Chairmanship, especially when it come to the theme of the EEF.

Also, the consultative process stipulated by the Brussels MC decision is in place, and successive Chairmanships have made effective use at the beginning of each year. Usually, the themes of each EEC are agreed among all delegations.

It is possible, nonetheless, to make a better use of the EEC. Participating States could consider extending the use of this platform to review the implementation of commitments, discuss recent economic and environmental developments that have a security impact in the OSCE region, and build confidence among them.

Fourth and final, the review of our commitments. Over the years, the Economic and Environmental Dimension Implementation Meeting has proved its value. However, such mechanism is almost unknown outside Vienna, and does not get sufficient attention from civil society organizations, the business community or the private sector.

These stakeholders take a keen interest on many issues of our mandate such as good governance and environmental protection to make just a couple of examples. Their greater involvement in the review of our commitments would certainly mutually beneficial.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Colleagues,

Finally, let me add that the advantage of the Second Dimension rests, among other factors, with the widespread perception that it is the least politicized and controversial of the OSCE's three dimensions. It seems to me that perception is still there, otherwise we would not have managed to adopt the decision on climate change last year.

We must use of this comparative advantage wisely, particularly as we approach the 50th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

We have a collective responsibility to make sure that the second dimension is fit for purpose. And we must enable it to unleash fully its potential to foster dialogue, build confidence, diminish tensions and promote good neighborly relations.

I look forward to your views and to an interactive discussion.

Thank you for your attention!