



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

PC.DEL/651/04/Rev.1
29 July 2004

ENGLISH only

Bulgarian Chairmanship

2004 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23 and 24 June 2004

CHAIR'S REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Decision No. 601 on the dates of the 2004 Annual Security Review Conference	1
Decision No. 604 on the agenda and modalities of the 2004 Annual Security Review Conference.....	2
Chairperson's Perception.....	8
Session 1: Preventing and combating terrorism.....	10
Session 2: Border security and management	14
Session 3: Comprehensive security, a strategic approach	18
Session 4: The way forward.....	22
List of proposals and suggestions	24



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

PC.DEC/601
18 March 2004

Original: ENGLISH

500th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 500, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 601
DATES OF THE 2004 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE**

The Permanent Council,

Decides that the 2004 Annual Security Review Conference (2004 ASRC) will take place in Vienna on 23 and 24 June 2004.



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

PC.DEC/604
1 April 2004

Original: ENGLISH

503rd Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 503, Agenda item 4

**DECISION No. 604
AGENDA AND MODALITIES OF THE
2004 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE**

The Permanent Council,

Decides:

To organize the 2004 Annual Security Review Conference (2004 ASRC) with the agenda and organizational modalities contained in the annexes to this decision.

AGENDA OF THE 2004 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23 and 24 June 2004

Programme

23 June 2004

- 10–10.30 a.m. Opening session
- 10.30 a.m. – 1 p.m. Session 1: Preventing and Combating Terrorism
- 3–6 p.m. Session 2: Border Security and Management

24 June 2004

- 10 a.m. – 1 p.m. Session 3: Comprehensive Security, a Strategic Approach
- 3–5.30 p.m. Session 4: The Way Forward
- 5.30–6 p.m. Closing session

Agenda

Opening session

(23 June, 10–10.30 a.m.)

The opening should set the stage for the 2004 ASRC.

Session 1: Preventing and Combating Terrorism

(23 June, 10.30 a.m. – 1 p.m.)

This session will review the developments in the implementation of commitments and the structure for comprehensive action by participating States and the Organization to address, as a main priority, the threat of terrorism, its manifestations and conditions that may foster and sustain it, established through decisions and documents adopted in 2001, 2002 and 2003, and should evolve possible improvements through dialogue. This review might include the threats of proliferation of SALW, including MANPADS, as well as travel document security, the Counter-Terrorism Network and the protection of human rights while combating terrorism.

Session 2: Border Security and Management

(23 June, 3–6 p.m.)

This session will review the implementation of the commitment to strengthening the OSCE's capacities to promote open but at the same time secure borders, *inter alia*, through the elaboration of an OSCE Border Security and Management Concept in order to enhance mutually beneficial inter-State co-operation and capacity building. The review might include OSCE border-related activities and experiences and evolve possible improvements for the development of OSCE's potential in border security and management.

Session 3: Comprehensive Security, a Strategic Approach

(24 June, 10 a.m. – 1 p.m.)

This session will review the threats and challenges to security and stability in the OSCE area and responses, in particular of a politico-military nature. The review might include the framework for permanent political and security dialogue to identify, analyse and react to new threats, the effectiveness of security activities across all three dimensions of the OSCE, strategic changes in the security environment, the changing character of armed conflict, particular contributions of the FSC, as well as that of existing arms control agreements/treaties, including regional agreements and non-proliferation.

Session 4: The Way Forward

(24 June, 3–5.30 p.m.)

This session will discuss the way forward, in particular with the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century. This might include the overall capacity of the OSCE to identify, analyse and take co-ordinated action in response to threats and challenges, implementation, outreach, co-operation with other international organizations, as well as confidence- and security-building measures.

Closing session

(24 June, 5.30–6.p.m)

Chair's first perception, based on the contributions of the rapporteurs.

ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2004 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23 and 24 June

Background

The Porto Ministerial Council of the OSCE, by adopting 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 participating States, to provide an opportunity to exchange views on issues related to arms control and confidence- and security-building and to promote the exchange of information and co-operation with relevant international and regional organizations and institutions.

Organization

The opening and closing sessions will be chaired by a representative of the Chairman-in-Office. The Secretariat will issue a journal of the opening and closing sessions.

Each of the other sessions will have a designated co-ordinator and a rapporteur. The task of the co-ordinators will be to facilitate the discussion, while the task of the rapporteurs will be to present a written report. Written reports will be distributed afterwards, co-ordinated by the Chair.

Standard OSCE rules of procedure and working methods will be followed, *mutatis mutandis* at the Conference.

Interpretation into all six working languages of the OSCE will be provided.

The OSCE Secretariat is requested to provide factual information to be collected by the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) by 1 June 2004.

The CPC will distribute the received written contributions to delegations in the first week of June. The information could also include contributions of OSCE institutions and other international organizations, if appropriate. Information that is available on the OSCE Delegate's Website will not be distributed.

Participation

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 bodies and institutions will participate in the conference, as well as the Secretary General and the Conflict Prevention Centre. The Parliamentary Assembly, the Partners for Co-operation and the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation will be invited to participate.

Other international organizations to be invited are the security-related organizations mentioned in Permanent Council Decision No. 563, dated 30 October 2003.

Security-related scientific institutes, “think tanks” of international standing or NGOs could be considered to be invited as keynote speakers or otherwise be represented as members of national delegations.

The Secretariat will send out a circular note to invite participating States and institutions, to inform the Secretariat of the composition of their delegations to the ASRC by 17 May 2004.

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

General guidelines for participants

The detailed work of the ASRC will be conducted in four sessions, each of which will concentrate on one topic, introduced by one or more keynote speakers, which may be followed by a discussion of any number of relevant sub-topics that delegates may wish to raise. Each of the sessions mentioned in the agenda has been assigned a number of such subjects for illustrative purposes. These lists are not exhaustive. To reinforce the effectiveness of security activities across all three dimensions of the OSCE, it is expected that the interfaces of security will be addressed in each of the groups, as will the question of co-operation with other international organizations.

To promote an interactive discussion, no intervention should exceed five minutes.

Guidelines for keynote speakers

The contributions of keynote speakers should stimulate debate among delegations by raising appropriate questions and suggesting potential recommendations that are based on OSCE realities.

The maximum available speaking time is 20 minutes per keynote speaker; where there are two keynote speakers in the same session, the total maximum is 30 minutes.

The contribution of a keynote speaker should set the scene for the discussion in the session.

The contributions of the keynote speakers should be focused on the subject and should be concrete.

They should dedicate part of their speech, and/or written contribution to the enhancement of the security dialogue on work undertaken by the OSCE and its participating States.

To enable delegations to prepare themselves, keynote speakers should provide a written contribution to the Conflict Prevention Centre by 1 June 2004.

In their presentations, keynote speakers should address the highlights of their contribution.

Guidelines for co-ordinators and rapporteurs

The co-ordinator chairs the session.

The co-ordinator should facilitate and focus the dialogue among delegations.

The co-ordinator should stimulate the debate by introducing items related to the subject of the working session, if appropriate, in order to broaden or focus the scope of the discussion, and to reinforce the effectiveness of security activities across all three dimensions of the OSCE, it is expected that the interfaces of security will be addressed.

The rapporteur's report should address issues raised during the respective session, and should cover problem areas, improvements, suggestions made at the session, and other relevant information.

Personal views shall not be advanced.

Guidelines for participation of other international organizations

Factual information on their organization, useful for the participants of the ASRC should be provided to the Conflict Prevention Centre of the OSCE by 1 June 2004 and should not be brought to the attention of participants during the Conference.

These organizations may be represented at the opening and closing sessions and may participate in the other sessions; their contribution should concentrate on aspects of co-operation with the OSCE.

CHAIRPERSON'S PERCEPTION

We have just held the second Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC), in accordance with the decision of the Porto Ministerial Council meeting. The most important thing about this conference was that for the first time we had the opportunity to review not only the OSCE's activities in the first dimension (politico-military), but also the implementation of the Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century, adopted by the Maastricht Ministerial Council Meeting in December 2003.

In its relatively short history, the OSCE has acted as a catalyst for fostering security and co-operation in Europe. The Organization started in Helsinki nearly 30 years ago, and was redefined in the Charter of Paris for a New Europe and in the Istanbul Charter for European Security, thus adapting itself to the changing security environment in Euro-Atlantic area. And now we can say that the OSCE is able to continue to fulfil its unique role as the largest regional organization devoted to the goal of comprehensive security.

In four working groups we had broad discussions on the new security threats and challenges in the OSCE area and beyond. The discussions clearly brought out the cross-dimensional character of these threats and challenges.

There was general agreement that terrorism was still the greatest security threat in the OSCE area and that combating it was to remain very high up on the agenda of the Organization. As a result of the discussions several areas for further OSCE work were outlined: container security; chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear materials; the role of the media; cyber-crime and related matters. The need to respect human rights while countering terrorism was also stressed.

Special attention was given to border security and management. During the discussions delegations stressed the importance of the cross-dimensional and integrated approach in border issues: cross-border, inter-State, regional and subregional co-operation; avoiding duplication; consensus on common goals and methods; professional and well-equipped border police staff, to name a few related issues. It was recognized that the OSCE South-Eastern Europe Cross-Border Co-operation Programme should be continued and that the activities in the framework of the Ohrid Process had model character for other regions in the OSCE. The development of an OSCE Border Security and Management Concept was broadly supported.

Delegations in general considered traditional CSBMs to be substantial OSCE tools in the first dimension. The CFE Treaty was considered a cornerstone of European security, while the Treaty on Open Skies was commended as another important legal instrument contributing greatly to openness and transparency. Special attention was paid to further implementation of the OSCE Document on SALW aimed specifically at more comprehensive control of the possession, transfer, brokering and stockpiling of SALW.

Attention was drawn to the importance of co-operation with partners outside the OSCE area and of identifying common interests in the politico-military field. In the debate

delegations recognized the OSCE's indisputable strength in conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

There was agreement that the OSCE should in the future remain focused on areas where it can add value. In this regard, special attention should be paid to implementation of the entire acquis of CSCE/OSCE norms and obligations, to the field competence of the OSCE and to the OSCE's role in regional conflict resolution. It is also imperative that we remain conscious of the possibility of new challenges to peace and stability.

Several delegations also pointed out the close correlation between human security and gender equality, and the need to recognize this if the OSCE is to be able to cope with security threats and challenges effectively.

Delegations were of the opinion that no single State or organization can, meet the challenges facing us on its own. Co-ordination of the efforts of all relevant international, regional and subregional organizations, bodies and institutions is therefore essential. In this respect the development of an *ad hoc* consultative mechanism for interacting with all these organizations is to be considered.

We have had only half a year for the implementation of our Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century. Nevertheless, we can say that we have made a good start. Activities have been initiated in a variety of working groups, in the Secretariat, the FSC and the ODIHR, and they have already produced a number of important documents and decisions.

Work still has to be done on the suggestions and proposals made during the conference. This will require initiative on the part of national delegations and institutions. There are also items that can be worked on in the IGFs, with a change in tasking possibly being needed. The Chair will take action to give consideration to suggestions and proposals made at this second ASRC.

SESSION 1: PREVENTING AND COMBATING TERRORISM

Co-ordinator: H.E. Ambassador Colin Munro, United Kingdom

Rapporteur: Mr. Denis Sidorenko, Belarus

Keynote Speakers: H.E. Admiral James Loy, Deputy Secretary of the United States
Department of Homeland Security

Mr. Gijs de Vries, European Union Counter-terrorism Co-ordinator

In his opening remarks, the Co-ordinator Ambassador Munro, pointed out that the fight against terrorism was an OSCE priority and would certainly remain very high on its agenda in the future, as the threat presented by terrorism would only increase. In this respect he drew attention to the emphasis on OSCE anti-terrorist activities made in the opening address by the Chairman-in-Office and indicated that the task of the session was firstly to review the implementation of commitments in the counter-terrorism area undertaken by participating States in the Bucharest Plan of Action, the Porto Charter for Preventing and Combating Terrorism, and other OSCE documents and decisions, and secondly to identify possible additional areas for OSCE action. The first keynote speaker Admiral James Loy, Deputy Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland Security, noted in his address the important achievements of the OSCE in its efforts to combat terrorism since the first ASRC, particularly in the areas of travel documents security (adopting ICAO standards for the handling and issuing of travel documents, and commitment to the issuing of machine readable passports by 2005), combating the financing of terrorism (Financial Action Task Force self-assessment) and MANPADS (FSC decision on the OSCE principles of export controls of MANPADS).

Admiral Loy underlined the importance of ensuring proper border management and security in fighting terrorism and shared United States experience in setting up “smart borders” that speed the flow of legitimate trade and travel while keeping terrorists out. In this regard he welcomed the OSCE emphasis on enhancing border security, and expressed his hope for the adoption of an action-oriented OSCE concept of border management and security at the next OSCE Ministerial.

Admiral Loy also suggested some further areas for action on the part of the OSCE participating States, for example incorporating interoperable biometric indicators into passports and visas (facial recognition and finger scan), and improving container security. In particular, he emphasized the need to develop common standards and consistent procedures to secure cargo (a code of conduct for container security), which should include the establishment of methods of transmitting, checking and sharing documents; the creation of a uniform system for exchanging customs data in a regularized format; and the development of standardized electronic seals. To this end Admiral Loy called on the OSCE participating States to undertake, before the end of the year, a political commitment to co-operating closely on improving container security.

Admiral Loy also expressed the support of the United States for the G8's security agenda, including travel, port and maritime security, fighting cyber-crime, protecting infrastructure, and combating corruption.

The second keynote speaker Mr. Gijs de Vries, European Union Counter-terrorism Co-ordinator, underlined the importance the European Union attaches to combating the scourge of terrorism. He elaborated in detail on internal and external European Union (EU) policies in the field of counter-terrorism, presenting concrete steps undertaken by the EU in accordance with its 2001 Action Plan, the 2003 European Security Strategy, and recent European Council decisions. Among EU priorities he mentioned action against the financing of terrorism, and the proliferation of WMD, and measures promoting the protection of critical infrastructure, co-operation on civil protection, and measures promoting the development of intelligence capacity.

Pointing out that international co-operation is crucial to the fight against terrorism, Mr. de Vries also gave a summary of EU external co-operation and partnerships. In particular, he presented information on a number of agreements concluded between the EU and the US in the field of combating terrorism, and on the EU-Russia dialogue. He also praised the co-operation between the European Union and the OSCE on the basis of common principles and values. He gave a positive assessment of the OSCE's progress on border security, travel documents, MANPADS, good governance, and the rule of law.

Mr. de Vries agreed with Admiral Loy that border security is a crucial element in the fight against terrorism, and briefed the conference on measures taken by the EU in border controls, specifically mentioning biometrics, information-sharing on lost and stolen passports, and the use of air passenger data. He also emphasized that the EU was currently developing its counter-terrorism assistance strategies to raise the capability of third countries to meet their obligations under the United Nations Security Council resolution 1373, and would explore the possibility of close co-operation with the OSCE on this issue. He also stated that there could be no trade-off between counter-terrorism activities and human rights.

The Conference was then briefed on the work of the Informal Group of Friends of the Chair on Combating Terrorism by its Chairman, Ambassador Krister Bringéus, Sweden. Underlining the clear resolve of OSCE participating States to combat terrorism and to develop appropriate tools for doing so, he spoke about two initiatives that had been discussed in the Group during the year and had led to the preparation of the draft decisions to be adopted by the Reinforced Meeting of the Permanent Council on 1 July 2004. They covered the issues of solidarity with the victims of terrorism (Spanish proposal), and of further measures to suppress the financing of terrorism (Russian proposal).

The Head of the Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU) Brian Woo briefed participants on the Unit's activities to support participating States in their implementation of anti-terrorism commitments, especially on ratification of the 12 United Nations conventions and protocols and fulfilling the commitments of the Maastricht Ministerial Council decision on travel document security. He expressed support for concrete ideas presented by a number of delegations who pointed out the necessity of responding in quick, focused and practical ways to real-time terrorist threats. Mr. Woo furthermore outlined the work the ATU is doing to achieve better and more effective co-ordination with other international organizations and drew attention to the significant contribution that other OSCE institutions and bodies, and the field operations, are making to OSCE's counter-terrorism work.

The ODIHR Co-ordinator on Anti-Terrorism Issues Mr. Peter Keay presented to delegations a food-for-thought paper entitled *Preventing and Combating Terrorism: The New Security Environment*, which focused on the issue of respect for human rights in the context of the fight against terrorism. He also presented a number of recommendations for the OSCE to consider, one of which was that the Organization endorse the Council of Europe's Guidelines on Human Rights and the Fight against Terrorism. A number of delegations welcomed the ODIHR paper and the lead the paper had taken in this respect. Pointing out that the safeguarding of human rights and fundamental freedoms is itself a vital part of the effort to combat terrorism, participants strongly supported the need to respect human rights principles and standards fully in anti-terrorist activities. One delegation suggested organizing a separate, more substantive discussion on the ODIHR paper at a later stage. Another delegation proposed holding a seminar on the role of NGOs and the mass media in the fight against terrorism.

Some delegations and international organizations shared their experience of combating terrorism. One delegation provided information on its efforts to ensure security and to prevent terrorist acts at a major international event.

There was general agreement that participating States could make more effort to become parties to the 12 relevant United Nations conventions and protocols. It was underlined that the OSCE could assist participating States with their implementation of these agreements, first of all through the development and implementation of anti-terrorism legislation and also by capacity-building. One delegation proposed holding an OSCE United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) working meeting on the implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1373.

In general, delegations expressed their interest and support for the container security initiative. Due to the complexity of the issue some delegations proposed further study of its technical aspects in order to identify the OSCE's added value. One delegation, while recognizing the importance of the problem, warned against creating obstacles for international trade by introducing excessively high standards for container security, and suggested organizing an appropriate expert workshop.

The issues of combating the financing of terrorism and money-laundering were touched upon by a number of delegations. One delegation stated the need for additional measures to deal with terrorist-financing based on the eight special FATF recommendations. Another delegation suggested extending the FATF recommendations to the OSCE Partners for Co-operation.

It was also suggested that further consideration should be given to the OSCE's activities related to proliferation of WMD, and furthermore of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) materials that can be used for terrorist acts. In this regard one delegation proposed that the OSCE, could serve as a "clearing house", and assist participating States by providing technical assistance, at their request, to implement United Nations Security Council resolution 1540.

On travel document security some delegations expressed their support for the idea presented by the keynote speakers on the sharing of data on lost and stolen passports through Interpol, and of advance passenger information.

The issues of cyber-crime and of the use of the Internet by terrorist organizations were also raised in several statements. One delegation pointed out that terrorist organizations use the Internet for recruiting, financing and even organizing terrorist acts and pointed out the need for the OSCE to tackle this issue through, among other things, exchange of information.

A number of delegations stressed their support for continuing OSCE efforts to deal with security risks arising from MANPADS, SALW and stockpiles of surplus ammunition and explosives in the OSCE area. One delegation expressed its belief in the continued relevance of all politico-military instruments in the OSCE, especially the Code of Conduct.

Some delegations also underlined the need to focus on the root causes of terrorism and such factors contributing to it as intolerance, extremism or poverty, by, for example, developing further OSCE educational activities and strategies for the de-motivation of perpetrators. One delegation focused on the links between conflicts and terrorism, and between organized crime and terrorism, indicating that terrorism can be State-sponsored.

It was stated that the ATU needed effective support, to which end one delegation proposed increasing its financial and human resources. Another delegation also suggested considering ways of using the OSCE Counter-terrorism Network more effectively.

A number of delegations, recognizing the United Nations' leading role in the fight against terrorism, advocated closer co-operation between the OSCE and the United Nations, and furthermore with other international, regional and subregional organizations. Attention was also drawn to the need to strengthen co-operation with the OSCE Partners for Co-operation in the field of combating terrorism.

SESSION 2: BORDER SECURITY AND MANAGEMENT

- Co-ordinator: H.E. Ambassador Dieter Boden, Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE
- Rapporteur: Ms. Sintija Visnevskā, Defence Adviser of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Latvia to the OSCE
- Keynote Speakers: Dr. Rüdiger Kass, Director-General for the Federal Border Police Service in the Ministry of the Interior of the Federal Republic of Germany
- Mr. Goran Krsteski, Border Police/Head of the Section for European Integration and Cross-Border Co-operation of the Ministry of the Interior of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

In his opening remarks, the Co-ordinator, Ambassador Boden, noted that it was the first time that border security and management had been treated as a separate theme at the Conference, which was surprising given that the OSCE has been involved in border security issues since the Helsinki Final Act, through the Helsinki Document 1992 and Istanbul 1999, up to the Maastricht Ministerial Council meeting at which the OSCE committed itself to developing the Border Security and Management Concept. The Co-ordinator was sure that the contributions of the keynote speakers and the following debates would represent a crucial stage in the further development of this important concept.

The first keynote speaker, Dr. Kass, Director-General for the Federal Border Police Service in the Ministry of the Interior of the Federal Republic of Germany, focused on several key elements. He drew attention to the increased importance of the external borders in the European Union in the light of the fact that internal border controls will soon be largely abolished and the free, unchecked movement of individuals and goods will be part of everyday life in Europe.

Dr. Kass started his speech with a short threat assessment, pointing out likely increased uncontrolled migratory flows to Europe, spreading organized cross-border crime, terrorism etc. These threats would affect not only European Union member States but all States in Europe. Dr. Kass said that these threats call for effective Europe-wide counter-measures, for the development of new strategies and for cross-border co-operation.

In his speech, Dr. Kass took Germany as an example in order to illustrate how co-operation could be increased. Federal border police co-operation relies on multinational and bilateral co-operation. The multinational approach was exemplified in the "European Border Police" in which Germany takes an active part. Dr. Kass emphasized the importance of the establishment of the European Border Police Agency dealing with strengthened and intensified co-ordination, evaluation, reporting, the training of border police officers across the EU, the conducting of joint operations, and the procuring of joint equipment.

Dr. Kass also outlined such bilateral measures as the disposition of German police officers at airports and sea harbours in Italy and Spain, and joint patrols with Austrian,

Italian, Polish and Czech police officers. In addition Germany is bilaterally assisting a number of States to set up democratically structured border police organizations within the framework of EU Phare Twinning Projects. Assistance in training and equipment is another area where Germany is playing an active role. Dr. Kass noted the OSCE's role in securing peace in Europe and promoting co-operation among the States of Europe. He pointed out the importance of the OSCE contribution in the border security area and in the development of border protection strategy.

When closing, Dr. Kass emphasized several matters for consideration as a possible contribution to the OSCE Border Security and Management Concept: (1) A border police should be based on the police model and its military character should be replaced by a civilian one; (2) There is a need for high-performance, efficient and effective police organizations with modern equipment; (3) The keynotes for border police organizations are: being democratic; good leadership; respect for human rights; and civil servants' rates of pay must not encourage corruption; (4) Border police organizations must be reasonably embedded into the security structure of a given country, and overlapping tasks, double or chaotic powers must be avoided; (5) Only very close and genuinely trusting co-operation with neighbour countries and with the European authorities will lead to success. Dr. Kass expressed the readiness of Germany to continue assistance and support in the field of border security and management.

The second keynote speaker, Mr. Krsteski, Border Police/Head of the Section for European Integration and Cross-Border Co-operation of the Ministry of the Interior of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, began with a description of the overall process of developing Europe as a field of freedom, movement and justice, and by underlining the greatest challenge for Europe, namely border management and trans-border co-operation. This was especially so given that crime control is no longer only a national task.

Mr. Krsteski pointed out the important role of already existing and emerging national and intergovernmental agencies and organizations within European Union in the improvement and reinforcement of border security and management. He highlighted the avoidance of duplication as one of the most important related matters.

Mr. Krsteski stressed the importance of achieving a good balance between maintaining open and at the same time ensuring well-controlled and secure borders. The concept of integrated border management (IBM) should comply with the aim of reinforcing the protection of the rights and interests of the inhabitants of EU member States and to develop the EU as an area of freedom, security and justice. Co-operation among State institutions and agencies is vital if this is to be achieved. In order to ensure border management which is efficient and also combats terrorism, organized crime and illegal migration, appropriate inputs needed to be made, not only by the EU, but also by the regions, and by South-Eastern Europe in particular. There was a need for individual national strategies for IBM and for their implementation, and for regional co-operation in the field of IBM with the support of the EU.

In his speech, Mr. Krsteski outlined the experience of the Republic of Macedonia in respect of development and achievements in the field of border security and management. By reviewing relevant Macedonian activities in this field, Mr. Krsteski pointed out that further development will be oriented towards close co-operation among the ministries and services, harmonized working procedures and mechanisms, implementation of the laws and

regulations, and education and training of Border Service staff. Mr. Krsteski touched upon the OSCE's important role and contribution in providing training and education, and in organizing seminars on border security and management. Recalling certain key political aims deriving from the Ohrid regional conference, Mr. Krsteski stressed the beneficial nature of the OSCE's activities in reinforcing trans-border co-operation, and in facilitating exchange of experience of the border-securing process. Mr. Krsteski closed by underlining the importance of (1) further implementation of the national IBM-related strategies developed within the frame of Ohrid border process; (2) the conclusion of agreements on trans-border co-operation; and (3) follow-up with reinforced relevant international assistance.

The co-ordinator opened the floor for discussion. Representatives of participating States and international organizations took the floor. Many of the delegates reflected on the keynote speeches, expressing their support for what was said. The discussions were comprehensive and touched upon various issues in the field of border security and management.

In their interventions many delegations expressed strong support for the efforts of the OSCE in the area of border security and management. Several delegations mentioned with satisfaction that the OSCE had made a distinctive contribution by organizing seminars and training, promoting the implementation of the Ohrid programme, and encouraging co-operation in the field of border security.

Bearing in mind the international security environment and present threats, several delegations emphasized the need to develop resources for increased border security and tighter control. On the other hand, free flow of goods and persons was also to be considered fundamental to good border management. The discussions led to the acknowledgement that these two concepts are complementary and not contradictory.

During the discussions, most of the delegations gave information about their national and regional activities, achievements and gained experience. Many delegations stressed the importance of a cross-dimensional and integrated approach in border issues; of cross-border, inter-State, regional, and subregional co-operation; of avoiding duplication; of understanding common goals and methods; and of the need for professional and well-equipped border police staff.

It was also stressed by several delegations that responsibility for borders remains first and foremost with the individual States. Work on border security should start not on the borders but already within the State, by harmonizing legislation, by enabling all mechanisms to work effectively, and by ensuring good governance and administration. The development of the OSCE Border Security and Management Concept was broadly supported. A lot of attention was given to further aspects that should be included in the Concept.

It was suggested that the Border Security and Management Concept (1) should be instrumental in the fight against terrorism and organized crime, and contribute both to the prevention of conflicts and to post-conflict rehabilitation; (2) should promote cross-border contacts, facilitate the free flow of goods and ideas, promote closer contacts between peoples, and contribute to regional co-operation; (3) should explore the potential of those activities in which the OSCE can provide comparative advantage and added value.

Suggestions and recommendations for further consideration

- Issues related to border security and management are highly relevant in the OSCE area. Border management is a tool for dealing with such issues as terrorism, trafficking, illegal migration and organized crime.
- There is clearly a role for the OSCE in this field. There is broad support for the elaboration of the Border Security and Management Concept. Some support for the OSCE/United Nations Conference on Borders was expressed.
- The OSCE Border Security and Management Concept should enumerate existing border-related commitments, among them the principles of the Helsinki Charter, in particular the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity.
- It should promote the idea that borders should be both open and secure. Openness and security are complementary concepts which reinforce each other.
- It should take into account the specific situation of countries in transition. It should contribute to the avoidance of new dividing lines in Europe.
- Co-operation between the countries involved is essential. The OSCE should facilitate and promote such co-operation, e.g., in the field of the fight against illegal migration. Regional and subregional co-operation should be promoted.
- When pursuing border-related activities the OSCE should increase its outreach to other international organizations to allow it to determine better where it can provide added-value training and advice within its area of application.
- The following specific fields of activity were suggested:
 1. The promotion of cross-border, inter-State, subregional and OSCE-wide co-operation;
 2. The development and dissemination of standards and best practices, training as well as advice and assistance on institution-building, in particular on the transfer of border control from military to civilian border police;
 3. Assistance in the drafting of border statutes and standards governing border security and management;
 4. Exploration of possible ways to facilitate the cross-border movement of persons, goods and ideas while controlling illegal movements;
 5. Considering responding to requests for the good offices of the OSCE, through, inter alia, the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, for the resolution of border-related disputes.
- The OSCE South-Eastern Europe Cross-Border Co-operation Programme should be continued. These activities in the framework of the Ohrid Process have model character for other regions in the OSCE.

SESSION 3: Comprehensive Security, a Strategic Approach

- Co-ordinator: Ambassador L. Zannier, Director, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre
- Rapporteur: Mrs. M. Tomašovičová, *Chef de File* 2004 ASRC of the Forum for Security Co-operation, First Secretary of the Slovak delegation
- Keynote speakers: Professor M.V. Rasmussen, University of Copenhagen
Mr. O. Shamshur, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine

The co-ordinator opened the session with the suggestion that delegations approach the agenda from a broader perspective. He introduced an open-ended list of topics for discussion, concentrating on

- Strategic changes in the security environment – new threats and challenges;
- The particular contribution of the FSC, as well as that of existing arms control agreements/treaties, including regional and non-proliferation agreements;
- OSCE outreach activities.

In his key-note speech, Professor Rasmussen took an analytical approach by comparing security concerns of 1904 and 2004 in the OSCE area. Quoting H.J. Mackinder, he concentrated on a comparison of the global security environment, the proliferation of technology and new security agents. He commented on the positive and negative impacts of globalization, and expressed his opinion that forces of globalization should no longer be allowed to create instability in the OSCE area. He further suggested that “the OSCE may also provide a platform for attempts to stabilize and democratize the Middle East and thus address at least some of the underlying causes that may prevent new terrorist organizations from appearing”. Mr. Rasmussen drew attention of the delegations to the fact that the OSCE area borders on States with an interest in acquiring weapons of mass destruction, and that the OSCE participating States hold most of the world’s know-how on these weapons. He concluded that only effective co-ordination in the OSCE is the key to preventing proliferation.

The second key-note speaker, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine Mr. Shamshur offered a few concrete proposals for various aspects of OSCE activities, including suggestions

- To look at OSCE documents related to the politico-military sphere from the point of view of their actual relevance for defining national security policies;
- To make an analysis of the structure of military budgets’ additional expenditures;
- To consider the usefulness of a discussion on the new CSBMs.

He called for the improvement of co-operation between the Permanent Council and the FSC, the OSCE institutions, and its field operations. He asked questions about the relationship between the OSCE and other collective security structures. In response to

delegations' reactions he questioned whether the presence of frozen conflicts in the OSCE area was any proof of the efficiency or inefficiency of the OSCE. Mr. Shamshur emphasized the importance of the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition, which was first used by Ukraine in its efforts to eliminate its excessive stockpiles.

In the ensuing debate, delegations discussed various topics related to the politico-military dimension, reacting to the thoughts expressed by the keynote speakers as well as to the co-ordinator's suggestions.

The European Union, in its statement, listed the four key implementation issues it has concentrated on in its activities, namely effective multilateralism, the fight against terrorism, strengthening relations with the Middle East region and the Arab world, and developing a comprehensive strategy for Bosnia-Herzegovina. The EU shared its views on effective multilateralism and its conclusions on co-operation with the OSCE as a part of this approach. The EU was among those who stated that more effective contacts and co-ordination between the EU and the OSCE could be developed. The EU considers co-operation with the OSCE an important part of the implementation of its European security and defence policy.

Opinions were then exchanged on the relationships between collective security structures. Two delegations stated that the OSCE should define its role in the broadening of regional groupings. One delegation, also in response to the second keynote speaker, stressed that dialogue, rather than competition, should prevail amongst the various collective security structures, especially when they all share common values. This delegation also noted that traditional CSBMs were developed for traditional threats, while what participating States were facing were threats posed by non-State actors. These new challenges call for deep analysis and new ways of conducting international relations. One delegation expressed its concern that other organizations have an incomparably higher impact on the OSCE's view of itself than the OSCE has on theirs. Another delegation expressed the view that the OSCE should identify the collective security tasks it is uniquely suited to perform. Many warned against duplication of efforts among collective security organizations. It was also stressed that the integration processes in Europe helped strengthen common values.

A substantial part of the session was dedicated to an exchange of views on possible responses to the new security challenges.

Delegations in general agreed on the value of traditional CSBMs as substantial OSCE tools in its first dimension. Nevertheless, some delegations called for a discussion on the development of improved, fourth-generation CSBMs in the light of the changing nature of threats and challenges, while others noted that such measures already *de facto* exist. Some delegations agreed that the OSCE toolkit in the politico-military dimension should be scrutinized and amended regularly, and argued that development of new CSBMs should be analysed carefully. Many stressed that consistent implementation and improvement of working methods should be high priorities for participating States, as should universalization. One delegation suggested that even if traditional CSBMs might not be suited to fighting terrorism, they could be used to solve, for example, frozen conflicts, if aptly combined with general disarmament measures. A suggestion that the various exchanges of information should be streamlined was supported by various delegations.

Delegations stressed the importance of co-operation with partners from outside the OSCE area and of identifying common interests in the politico-military field.

A few delegations stressed the importance of integrating the work of field missions with the implementation of OSCE politico-military tools such as CoC, SALW Document, Stockpiles, etc. was stressed by a few delegations.

Some delegations supported the idea of organizing a seminar on military doctrines, with agendas to be discussed and agreed with great care. Many delegations referred to the OSCE Document on SALW as a success story, but called for the further improvement of related activities aimed at a more comprehensive control of the possession, transfer, brokering and stockpiling of SALW. The need for co-operation among PC, CPC, FSC and field missions in implementing the SALW Document was stressed repeatedly.

One delegation suggested organizing a donor conference on excess stockpiles of conventional ammunition and explosives, bringing together the experts, donors and those participating States that might need assistance in their destruction projects. Another delegation recommended that the OSCE create a voluntary fund for stockpile destruction projects. One delegation offered assistance in the implementation of the Document in connection with security risks arising from stockpiles of ammunition and explosives. It was also suggested that a steering body should be established, probably within the CPC, to deal with conventional ammunition projects. One delegation suggested conducting specialized seminars on the Best Practice Guide on SALW throughout the OSCE area in order to make it better known outside Vienna.

Many delegations paid tribute to the FSC for adopting the Decision on principles of export control on MANPADS, and called for its immediate implementation. One delegation suggested a study of “gap-analysing” in guns’ life cycles, which would help to determine possible MANPADS areas not yet addressed by the OSCE.

A number of delegations referred to the active consideration of the standard elements in end-user certificates and verification procedures and of norms and principles for small arms-brokering by the FSC as another important step in the OSCE’s successful activities regarding SALW. Delegations expressed the hope that the FSC would conclude its discussion on the relevant decisions by the end of the year. It was also suggested that a special meeting of experts should be convened to analyse the whole spectrum of SALW efforts.

One delegation noted that participating States should pay more attention to the non-proliferation of biological and chemical materials. Another delegation suggested that the OSCE should play a clearing-house role in connection with United Nations Security Council resolution 1540, giving assistance to participating States needing support in its implementation. One delegation recommended that these issues be included in an enhanced FSC security dialogue.

Regional issues were referred to as important topics on the OSCE agenda. One delegation expressed the view that they should be a special focus of the OSCE’s work and expressed the hope that the next ASRC would pay more attention to such issues. Another delegation considered that the frozen conflicts in the Caucasus should be a priority task of the OSCE. One delegation spoke about its own experience of regional co-operation and expressed the view that close consultations among key players could help solve frozen

conflicts. This delegation appreciated the role played by the OSCE in conflict resolution. It was also suggested that the OSCE should play an even more important role in monitoring the Transdnestrian segment of the Moldovan-Ukrainian border, reflecting proposals from both Moldovan and Ukrainian participants.

A number of delegations referred to the CFE Treaty as a cornerstone of European security. One delegation expressed the hope that conditions would soon be created and that the adapted Treaty would continue to serve as the “incontestable anchor of European security architecture”. Two delegations called on the participating States to complete ratification of the adopted CFE Treaty. The Treaty on Open Skies was commended as a useful tool for confidence-building and transparency measures. The use of the Open Skies regime in other fields, such as ecology and the environment, was mentioned. One delegation expressed its hope that next year’s review conference would provide new impetus.

Other issues

One delegation suggested that human trafficking should be a priority among OSCE activities, while another noted that the settlement of existing regional conflicts should be at the heart of OSCE activities and criticized the inability of the OSCE to influence the process of conflict settlement effectively. This delegation called for a strengthening of political dialogue among participating States, to raise the level of respect for the OSCE principles.

Finally, various delegations considered the need to improve the working methods of the FSC, the structural interaction of the FSC with the PC and the quality of the dialogue. It was suggested that the discussion in Session 3 could be viewed as an example which could be taken into account in efforts to raise the quality of the dialogue.

SESSION 4: THE WAY FORWARD

Co-ordinator:	H.E. Ambassador Ivo Petrov, Bulgaria
Rapporteur:	Mr. Jörn Beißert, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE
Keynote Speakers:	H.E. Ambassador Marc Perrin de Brichambaut, Director for Strategic Affairs of the Ministry of Defence, France H.E. Ambassador Gérard Stoudmann, Director of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, Switzerland

In their keynote speeches Ambassador Marc Perrin de Brichambaut, Director for Strategic Affairs of the Ministry of Defence of France, and Ambassador Gérard Stoudmann, Director of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, analysed the new security environment and its consequences for the OSCE.

Ambassador Perrin de Brichambaut saw demographic developments and the distribution of wealth as the underlying factors determining a security environment which will remain prone to crises in the foreseeable future. He underlined the importance of crisis prevention. To achieve this, it was necessary to adopt a comprehensive approach including politics and diplomacy, policing and law enforcement, measures in the fields of economics and finance and also the cultural dimension. Ambassador Perrin de Brichambaut encouraged the OSCE to look beyond the OSCE area. The OSCE had an essential role to play in the promotion of co-operation and solidarity among the participating States. He emphasized that the OSCE should strengthen its co-operation with the United Nations, NATO and the EU. It should intensify its activities in the fields of terrorism, organized crime, and corruption.

Ambassador Stoudmann was confident that the OSCE would succeed in adapting to the new security environment and thus remain relevant. The political will of the participating States and reform were, however, crucial to this process. On the basis of the Organization's existing strengths, e. g., its comprehensive and co-operative approach to security, the OSCE would succeed in finding the right balance between the different dimensions of security. The OSCE not only had to address immediate threats such as terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, organized crime and trafficking, but also other challenges such as radicalism and intolerance. It also had to address the root causes of security threats. The OSCE should continue to play a role in crisis management, conflict prevention and early warning. New threats, such as terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and organized crime, should be addressed by means of concrete, pragmatic and readily implementable measures, within a policy of "niches". The OSCE should evaluate its field presences and other institutions, and improve their quality and performance. The OSCE should reinvigorate its politico-military instruments and endeavour to strengthen co-ordinated responses in critical infrastructure protection and enhanced cross-border co-operation. The OSCE should intensify its efforts in the field of capacity-building, the Bishkek Academy being an excellent example. There was a need for the creation of a credible follow-up mechanism with regard to early warning.

In the debate, there was general agreement that the OSCE had competitive advantages and specific strengths on which it should continue to build, for instance, its roles in conflict prevention, crisis management, conflict rehabilitation, and the promotion of the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms and its politico-military instruments.

Several delegations stressed that the OSCE had a significant role to play in promoting co-operation and co-ordination both among participating States and with international organizations. In this connection, one delegation emphasized the importance of the development of an ad hoc consultative mechanism. One international organization declared its willingness to be part of such a mechanism.

Many delegations emphasized that in view of the global nature of many threats and challenges, the OSCE should not limit its activities to the OSCE area. In this context, one delegation expressed its support for a joint OSCE/NATO/EU conference on the Mediterranean. Two delegations called for the OSCE to play a role in the monitoring of the upcoming elections in Afghanistan. One Partner for Co-operation suggested that both the Partners for Co-operation and the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation should participate regularly in the meetings of the Permanent Council and the Forum for Security Co-operation.

Many delegations praised the contribution of the OSCE to the fight against new threats, and called for further concrete, pragmatic and readily implementable answers to the challenges these new threats pose.

In particular, border security and management were identified as a field for further OSCE action. In this context, several delegations called for the continued implementation of the OSCE South-Eastern Europe Cross-Border Co-operation Programme. Several delegations also appealed to the OSCE to explore possible ways of assisting Tajikistan to strengthen its border-control capability. One delegation suggested strengthening the OSCE's capability by creating a distinct unit dealing with border issues in the Conflict Prevention Centre of the OSCE Secretariat.

In several interventions stress was laid upon the usefulness of enhanced co-operation between the Parliamentary Assembly and the bodies of the OSCE in which the participating States are represented was emphasized.

Several delegations called for more attention to be paid to matters relating to gender mainstreaming. A gender perspective should be taken into account in all OSCE activities. One delegation suggested that the OSCE organize a meeting at which female officers of the armed forces of the participating States could share their experiences.

The Co-ordinator concluded the meeting by stating that he was confident that the OSCE's inherent strengths and flexibility would enable it to rise to the challenges it faces in the new security environment.



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Conflict Prevention Centre
Operations Planning Unit

Vienna, 29 July 2004

LIST OF PROPOSALS AND SUGGESTIONS

The following table is an overview of the practical recommendations that were raised by delegations and speakers at the 2004 ASRC. These recommendations were put forward in writing, or in the context of oral presentations, or in discussions in the sessions. Some of these ideas and suggestions can be implemented at an early stage. Others will require further discussion and elaboration in the relevant forums.

Table of recommendations

No.	Task/reference
	Preventing and combating terrorism
1	Implement a set of international standards for capturing, analysing, storing, and protecting biometric data, in order to establish interoperable biometric systems that could include electronic passports, smart cards, or “virtual passports”.
2	Develop measures to contribute to the enhanced security of container shipments, (i.e., a Code of Conduct for container security), to include the establishment of methods of transmitting, checking and sharing documents.
3	Participating States to consider proposals made regarding container security in order to commit themselves to developing common standards in this area.
4	Develop a uniform system for exchanging customs data in a regularized format, and develop standardized electronic seals.
5	OSCE to formalize its endorsement of the Council of Europe’s Guidelines on Human Rights and the Fight Against Terrorism, as safeguarding human rights and fundamental freedoms is a vital part of the fight against terrorism.
6	Make greater use of the Counter-Terrorism Network.
7	Further expand the co-operation between the OSCE and the EAPC/PfP
8	Actively implement the Bucharest Plan of Action’s recommendation to strengthen co-operation with the OSCE Partners, including the Mediterranean Partners.
9	Address the threat of the use of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) materials in terrorist attacks.
10	Strengthen national and regional levels of counter-terrorism co-ordination.
11	Look into the issue of strengthening the security of civilian conventional explosives storage sites.
12	Take steps to increase security in the field of energy infrastructure.

No.	Task/reference
	Preventing and combating terrorism (continued)
13	Consider measures and ways to safeguard the Internet against abuse by terrorists.
14	Identify and pursue further means of preventing the financing of terrorism.
15	Contribute to implementing United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 by serving as a “clearing house”, and providing technical assistance for the participating States that request it.
16	Address the issue of respect for human rights in the fight against terrorism.
17	OSCE participating States to undertake commitments to join the Aviation Security Network.
18	OSCE participating States to undertake commitments to reporting lost and stolen passports to Interpol.
19	Hold a workshop on implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1373 and the Ratification of the 12 United Nations conventions and protocols related to terrorism, and also subregional and national seminars on this issue.
20	Hold a workshop on the role of media and NGOs in the fight against terrorism.
21	Organize a separate, more substantial discussion on the ODIHR paper at a later stage.
22	Expand FATF recommendations to apply to the OSCE Partners for Co-operation.
23	Further develop OSCE educational activities and consider ways of developing methods to de-motivate terrorists.
24	Increase financial and human resources within the ATU.
	Border security and management
25	In order to ensure efficient border management that also contributes to the fight against terrorism, organized crime, trafficking, and illegal migration, there is a need for appropriate inputs not only from the EU, but also from the countries involved, in particular in South-Eastern Europe.
26	OSCE to base the border security and management concept on norms enshrined in all OSCE documents and principles of international law, particularly the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity.
27	OSCE Border and Security Management Concept to promote open and secure borders, and to be an integrated approach taking into account the cross-dimensional character of border issues and combining the policies of all agencies and institutions engaged in the field of cross-border movement of people, goods and services.
28	The OSCE Border Security and Management Concept to take into account the specific situation of countries in transition.
29	OSCE to focus on the development and dissemination of standards and best practices, training, and assistance in institution-building, in particular in the transfer of border control from military to civilian border police.
30	OSCE to provide assistance in the drafting of border statutes and standards governing border security and management.
31	Explore possible ways of facilitating the cross-border movement of persons, goods and ideas while controlling illegal movements.

No.	Task/reference
	Border security and management (continued)
32	Consider responding to requests for the OSCE's good offices, including through the Court of Arbitration and Conciliation, in the resolution of border-related disputes, when appropriate through the Court of Arbitration and Conciliation.
33	Continue the OSCCP and consider the possibility of using it as a model that could be of relevance for other regions within the OSCE area.
34	<p>In developing the OSCE Border and Security Management Concept, the participating States are to consider such relevant factors as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — co-operation between countries concerned is essential to setting up high-performing, effective and efficient police forces; — the internal constitution, mentality and structure of border police organizations must be democratic; — respect for human rights must be mentioned as key words; — border police organizations must be embedded in the security structure of a given country; — border police organizations' procedures must be in line internationally.
35	The OSCE approach to border security and management should be flexible and capable of encompassing a variety of interests and necessities.
36	Regional and subregional co-operation should be promoted and organized according to the individual needs of the countries.
37	OSCE to develop a Border Security Management Concept based on integrating current OSCE field activities (Ohrid follow-up and initiatives in CA), and activities within various dimensions (i.e., fight against terrorism and trafficking in human beings) into a coherent framework, with an approach that is "less than OSCE-wide and more than purely bilateral".
38	OSCE to aim to provide comprehensive, tailor-made packages aimed at developing comparable standards by using a diversified, regional approach and creating realistic conditions for networking, taking into account resources from NGOs, think-tanks, and institutions.
39	OSCE to consider the framework of the basic EU principles of border management as a basis for setting up common international norms, principles and standards for Border Security and Management.
40	OSCE to give full consideration to the Document on SALW, as well as to the Code of Conduct, within the field of Border Security Management.
41	Actively involve the PA as regards the legislative aspects of the Border Management and Security.
42	Eliminate the weakest points in the field of Border Management and Security, and use international expertise.
43	OSCE to promote European standards of border protection, namely: civilian police character of the border forces; provision of suitable laws for refugees and detained foreigners; international agreements' regulation of the issues concerning re-admission and border co-operation; development of close co-operation between border services, including exchange of information and experience; creation of common points of contact, exchange of liaison officers, joint patrols and investigation groups.
44	OSCE to develop co-operation with illegal migrants' countries of origin.

No.	Task/reference
Border security and management (continued)	
45	OSCE to concentrate on projects where its contribution could give added value, i.e., where OSCE missions have already established a good basis for a project.
46	OSCE to focus on the elimination of divisions within the OSCE area, which could be achieved by securing open and well-managed borders, i.e., borders which encourage legitimate flows and present obstacles to illegitimate crossings; they are likely to produce positive effects in terms of security as well as in terms of prosperity.
47	With the agreement of all participating States, OSCE to adopt new objectives for border security management, including: cross-border co-operation between border guard services, development of relations between border services and specialized government agencies, and development of cross-border co-operation between specialized government agencies of participating, in particular neighbouring, States.
48	Connect border crossing points to INTERPOL.
49	All border security management options to be in accordance with international standards, in particular human rights and refugees' rights.
50	Establish an international mission for monitoring the eastern border of Moldova under the auspices of the OSCE and with EU support, in order to counteract illicit activities and to promote a border control system in accordance with European standards.
Comprehensive security, a strategic approach	
51	New threats to security require co-ordinated, comprehensive and more effective international action, including closer co-operation between the EU and the OSCE, particularly with a view to honouring more fully commitments to human rights, peace and democracy in the OSCE area.
52	Continue to address issue of illegal trafficking.
53	Update and develop traditional arms control regimes to meet the requirements of the new security environment, paragraphs 45 and 50 of the Strategy.
54	Conduct a seminar on military doctrines to analyse the strategic situation of the OSCE and doctrines of regional security organizations, with a well-focused agenda.
55	The FSC contribution to the next ASRC should be more substantial.
56	Develop a fourth generation of confidence- and security-building measures adequate for the new level of co-operation among OSCE participating States.
57	Make an inventory of all existing decisions in the SALW area, and review the implementation of the OSCE SALW document in 2005.
58	Hold an FSC meeting of experts, donor countries and partner organizations to consider further ways to implement the stockpiles of conventional ammunition document, and respond to requests from Ukraine, Belarus, and the Russian Federation.
59	Further increase and strengthen the role of the FSC within the OSCE.
60	Conduct an analysis of the present security environment in the OSCE area and an overview of OSCE politico-military documents in order to assure that the security work of the OSCE and in particular of the FSC remains focussed on present requirements and possibilities.

No.	Task/reference
	Comprehensive security, a strategic approach (continued)
61	<p>As regards the exchange of military information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Assess the complex obligations in order to streamline them according to actual relevance of information; — Shift the focus from a primarily formal approach to the assessment of the contents of the reports; — Resourceful countries should distribute a raw analysis of the data to the participating States to allow a general analysis and debate of the facts and emerging threats.
62	Assess all OSCE documents related to the politico-military dimension from the point of view of their relevance in defining national security policies, in order to make the security dialogue more practical and result-oriented.
63	Take further steps to address the brokering of SALW.
64	Seriously address the issues of stockpiles conventional ammunition, with the elaboration of specific projects.
65	MANPADS. Conduct a gap-analysis of the life-cycle of MANPADS (special experts meeting might be needed).
66	Conduct an in-depth analysis of the whole SALW issue.
67	Assess all CSBMs in view of the new challenges.
68	Improve the working methods and the structure of the politico-military dimension focusing on implementation aspects.
69	Take further steps to improve information exchanges.
70	Field missions should become part of the implementation process with regard to SALW and conventional ammunition surpluses.
71	Create a steering body (CPC unit) to work on implementation of SALW and conventional ammunition projects.
72	Explore the role of the CSBMs in addressing the new security challenges, including those posed by non-State actors.
73	Enrich the Security Dialogue by closely co-ordinating security-related activities with the EU and NATO, as well as by discussing counter proliferation/non-proliferation of WMD.
74	Consider expanding the Open Skies Regime to other fields such as ecological and environmental protection.
75	Continue to promote the Best Practice Guide on SALW outside Vienna, by conducting specialized seminars and promoting CPC activities.
76	Focus more attention on regional issues, including the settlement of existing regional conflicts.
77	Assess the results of the OSCE activities on the settlement of the so called “frozen conflicts” and the efficiency of the OSCE strategies being applied with this purpose.
78	Improve institutional interaction between the FSC and the PC.
79	Confirm the validity of CSBMs, scrutinize the FRCS toolkit and amend if necessary.
80	New approach to CSBMs with reference to the current security situation and the level of co-operation of the OSCE participating States.
81	Develop the OSCE border management concept and activities.
82	Integrate more fully the work on implementing politico-military elements of CoC, SALW and OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition and MANPADS in the field missions, centres and offices.

No.	Task/reference
Comprehensive security, a strategic approach (continued)	
83	Further improve CSBMs regime.
84	Follow-up on United Nations resolution on non-proliferation with the aim of establishing a clearing-house role for the OSCE.
85	OSCE to consider international monitoring of the Transdnistria-Ukraine border.
86	Conduct consultations between Ukraine, the Russian Federation and the OSCE with the involvement of the USA and the EU, with the aim of elaborating common approaches to the settlement of the Transdnistrian conflict.
87	Consider and discuss Ambassador Hill's proposal to entrust the OSCE Mission to Moldova with the additional task of monitoring the Transdnistrian segment of the Moldovan-Ukrainian border.
88	Upgrade and further develop the conflict prevention capacity of the OSCE with the aim of establishing a mechanism that will be triggered automatically if complications that could lead to a conflict emerge.
89	Make an analysis of changes in the military budgets of participating States with the aim of identifying the most challenging aspects of security and those which are losing their relevance.
The Way Forward	
90	OSCE to continue to play a role in crisis management, in particular before and after in the post-conflict rehabilitation phase, and to consider the feasibility of new imaginative initiatives in the field of frozen conflicts which might also be essential in the fight against organized crime.
91	OSCE to invest more in its human resources, with a long-term perspective, and to find non-bureaucratic ways to keep its qualified and experienced personnel while further increasing the recruitment of specialists, both in the field and at headquarters.
92	OSCE to develop new tools, not in the form of new bodies or institutions, but in the form of operations, particularly but not exclusively in the field, establishing co-operation also with specialized NGOs and "think-tanks".
93	OSCE to consider concrete, pragmatic and readily implementable measures, such as: measures to prevent access and acquisition of WMD materials; measures to exchange information on risks and co-ordinate response in the field of critical infrastructure protection; measures to harmonize and co-ordinate action in the field of trans-border crossing, also by holding regular meetings of experts.
94	OSCE not to continue to produce documents and declarations of intent, but to consider the development of an action plan and an implementation calendar for the new strategy adopted in Maastricht.
95	Participating States to encourage a more political role for the OSCE to perform more conflict mitigation and less service-providing.
96	OSCE to reinvigorate its politico-military instruments.
97	OSCE to continue to explore the potential for co-operation on a more regular basis with other States and organizations in the areas of trafficking in persons, and terrorism; such co-operation could be defined either geographically or topically.

No.	Task/reference
	The Way Forward (continued)
98	Further enhance non-hierarchical co-operation and co-ordination between the OSCE and other international organizations such as the United Nations, the European Union, NATO and the Council of Europe.
99	OSCE to remain focused in the future on areas where it can add value and give special attention to the implementation of the comprehensive <i>acquis</i> of CSCE/OSCE norms and obligations, to its field competencies, and to its role in regional conflict resolution.
100	Participating States to deepen OSCE involvement within the field of border management and security, and to equip the Secretariat with the means necessary to deal with this challenging task.
101	Participating States to report in writing on the national implementation of their commitments in security policy and arms control, so as to build a general picture of the state of affairs in the OSCE with regard to security and arms control; this could possibly be done on the basis of a questionnaire, to be developed by the CPC in consultation with participating States.
102	OSCE to make full use of its partnership with the Mediterranean and Asian partners, which could favour closer relations between the OSCE and those countries that do not have established relations with the Organization.
103	Provide economic assistance to “weakened States” in order to stop the development of illegal economies.
104	OSCE to urge participating States to ratify international conventions on corruption, and develop follow-up mechanisms (i.e., a mechanism for restitution of embezzled public funds and preventive measures).
105	OSCE to incorporate a gender aspect in all its activities, giving more consideration, in particular, to the role women play in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict reconstruction.
106	OSCE to provide an arena for a first female military exchange of experience; the results of such meeting could provide the basis for future cross-dimensional action.
107	Insert the issue of a follow-up to United Nations Security Council resolution 1235 on women, peace and security in the agenda of both the Permanent Council and the FSC.
108	Integrate a gender aspect into the agenda of next year’s ASRC.
109	Strengthen interaction with the PA, in order to successfully implement documents such as the Action Plans to combat human trafficking and to improve the situation of Roma and Sinti.
110	Participating States to renew and increase common political commitment, refocusing on the original tasks and improving the utilization of the tools available.
111	OSCE to make CBMs more effective, in particular by putting them at the disposal not only of early-warning and conflict management, but also of conflict resolution.
112	OSCE to start taking concrete steps towards the establishment of an ad hoc consultative mechanism, and to this end, to consider a series of high-level staff meetings among the Secretariats of the relevant international and regional organizations.
113	OSCE to jointly organize a tripartite conference by the OSCE-NATO-EU on the Mediterranean region.

No.	Task/reference
	The Way Forward (continued)
114	OSCE to continue to explore ways and means to further develop and strengthen its relations with its Partners for Co-operation, in line with the Threats Strategy and PC Decision No. 571.
115	OSCE to have a role in monitoring the elections in Afghanistan.
116	Explore ways of assisting Tajikistan strengthen its border-control capability.
117	Participating States to strengthen OSCE's capability in the field of border security and management by establishing a distinct unit in the Conflict Prevention Centre.
118	OSCE to enhance co-operation with the Parliamentary Assembly and the other OSCE bodies and institutions.