



**SESSIONS ON THE OSCE STRUCTURES AND THEIR ACTIVITIES
OF THE 2010 REVIEW CONFERENCE
21 – 26 OCTOBER 2010, VIENNA**

ANNOTATED AGENDA
Plenary Session on 18 October 2010
OSA Session 2 on 21 October 2010
Plenary Session on 26 October

BACKGROUND

The *1992 Helsinki Document and the 1994 Budapest Document* mandate the OSCE with organizing review conferences before meetings of OSCE Heads of State or Government (Summits). On 3 August 2010, the OSCE Ministerial Council adopted a decision on the time and venue of the next OSCE Summit and Review Conference (MC.DEC/3/10). In accordance with this decision, an OSCE summit will be held in Astana on 1-2 December 2010, and an OSCE Review Conference will be held in three parts: in Warsaw from 30 September to 8 October 2010, in Vienna from 18 to 26 October 2010 and in Astana from 26 to 28 November 2010.

According to the 1992 Helsinki Document, review conferences will “review the entire range of activities within the CSCE, including a thorough implementation debate, and consider further steps to strengthen the CSCE process”. “These reviews of implementation will be of a co-operative nature, comprehensive in scope and at the same time able to address specific issues”. “The participating States will be invited to offer contributions on their implementation experience, with particular reference to difficulties encountered, and to provide their views of implementation throughout the CSCE area. Participating States are encouraged to circulate descriptions of contributions in advance of the meeting.” “Reviews should offer the opportunity to identify action which may be required to address problems. Meetings at which reviews of implementation take place may draw to the attention of the CSO (*currently Permanent Council*) any suggestions for measures to improve implementation which they deem advisable.”

The overall agenda for the 2010 Review Conference was adopted by the Permanent Council in its Decision No. 952 of 29 July 2010 on the agenda, organizational framework, timetable and other modalities of the 2010 Review Conference. The Indicative Work Programme (IWP) of the Review Conference was adopted by the Permanent Council in its Decision No. 956 of 23 September 2010, and inter alia includes seven working sessions to address item 6(e) of the agenda of the Vienna Part of the Review Conference: “Review of OSCE structures and their activities, including consideration of proposals designed to enhance the role of the OSCE and further strengthen its capabilities (OSA)”, as well as review of OSCE co-operation with the Partners for Co-operation and international organizations and initiatives and of lessons learned from field activities. These sessions will take place from 21 to 26 October 2010 in Vienna. One of these sessions, namely OSA session No. 2 “Enhancing the role and further

*) excerpt - refers to the part of the sessions (plenary and OSA 2) open to NGOs

strengthening capabilities of the OSCE executive structures: Lessons learned from field activities”, will be open to attendance by NGOs.

This annotated agenda intends to provide participants with guidelines to help them prepare for active and constructive participation in the OSA working sessions. Information on the modalities of the Review Conference can be found in PC.DEC/952 and RC.INF/1/10.

This annotated agenda intends to provide participants with guidelines to help them prepare for active and constructive participation in the OSA working sessions. Information on the modalities of the Review Conference can be found in PC.DEC/952 and RC.INF/1/10.

INTRODUCTION TO OSA SESSIONS

The 2010 review of OSCE structures and their activities, including consideration of proposals designed to enhance the role of the OSCE and further strengthen its effectiveness and capabilities to become a full-fledged international organization and address the priorities of the participating States, could build upon the progress achieved since the last comprehensive review exercise held at the 1999 Review Conference, which was reflected in the results of the 1999 Istanbul OSCE Summit. The last eleven years of the Organization’s evolution are characterized by a number of accomplishments and open issues pertaining to strengthening the role and capabilities of the Organization and enhancing its effectiveness. The last collective analysis of these issues was done by all participating States within the framework of the Corfu Process. Therefore, the discussions at the OSA sessions could, *inter alia*, reflect on the Corfu Process deliberations on enhancing the OSCE’s effectiveness, including but not necessarily limited to the proposals reflected in its Interim Report (CIO.GAL/117/10 of 2 July 2010). Also, open recommendations of the 2005 Panel of Eminent Persons (PEP) and “unfinished business” in implementing the 2005 Ljubljana Road Map in 2006, if any, could serve as useful references for the upcoming OSA discussions.

Within the Corfu Process, the participating States expressed the views that strengthening OSCE’s effectiveness implies both the responsibility to restore trust among themselves and the need to solve the problem of giving the OSCE a proper legal status as well as to enhance the work of OSCE decision-making bodies and executive structures. Two major inter-related objectives were identified: first, enhancing the role of the OSCE as a political forum, and second, reinforcing the ability of decision-making bodies and executive structures to support the participating States. Below is a non-exhaustive list of effectiveness-related decisions taken by the pS since the 1999 Review Conference within each of these two tracks (including only some of decisions which introduced major changes in the OSCE’s governing and executive structures and in the modalities of their work):

1. 1999 - establishment of the Preparatory Committee (PrepComm); 2001 Bucharest MC Decision which further clarified the roles of the PC and FSC and established the Economic and Environmental Sub-Committee; 2002 MC Decision on the role of the Chairmanship-in-Office; 2002 update of the modalities of human dimension meetings (established in 1992 and revised in 1998); 2002 MC Decision on ASRC; 2003 – ACMF terms of reference; 2004 MC Decision on the Economic Forum; 2006 MC Decision to dissolve the Senior Council and transfer its

tasks to the PC; 2006 – first ever codification of OSCE Rules of Procedure since 1973; 2006 – establishment of the three-committee structure under the PC; 2006 - PC guidelines on OSCE conferences.

2. 1999 – establishment of REACT; 2000 PC decision on strengthening OSCE operational capacities, establishment of the CPC-OS, External Co-operation Section and the OIO; 2001 – establishment of the Senior Police Advisor, followed by the establishment of the SPMU; 2002 – establishment of the ATU; 2002 and 2003 – improving the budgetary management of the OSCE and the Unified Budget process; 2003 – adoption of Staff Regulations; 2003 MC Decision on the OSCE Annual Report; 2003 – establishment of a mechanism to combat trafficking in human beings (THB), restructured in 2006; 2004 MC Decision on the role of the SG; 2004 – establishment of the Audit Committee; 2005 – establishment of the Common Regulatory Management System (CRMS); 2005 – Ljubljana MC Decision on strengthening the effectiveness of the OSCE; 2006 - Brussels MC Decisions on strengthening the effectiveness of the OSCE and its executive structures, including on the role of the SG and PBPB, work of the Permanent Council and the ODIHR; 2006 - revisions of Staff Regulations; 2008 - MC Decision on period of service of the SG.

At the same time, there are still a number of issues which could be considered for further decision-making by the participating States:

1. Development of guidelines for preparation of draft ministerial decisions; further improvement of functioning of informal subsidiary bodies of the PC; improving the current practice of holding OSCE meetings and meetings organized by the Chairmanships and executive structures, including their content and duration; participation of NGOs in OSCE meetings and in meetings of OSCE decision-making bodies; joint FSC-PC decision-making procedure; update of the OSCE Rules of Procedure, which were a codification or a “snapshot” of practices existing before 2006.

2. OSCE’s legal status and privileges and immunities; improving conditions of service in the OSCE; strengthening the effectiveness of the secondment system; further improvement of the programme budget planning process and extra-budgetary activities; reviewing OSCE Financial Regulations; strengthening the role of the Secretary General and the capacities of the Secretariat; effectiveness of Institutions; partnership between ODIHR and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly on election observation in the framework of Ministerial Decision 19/06; effectiveness of field operations; procedure of appointment of HoMs; supplementing the OSCE Rules of Procedure by provisions related to rules governing the work of OSCE executive structures; reviewing the mechanism of the three CiO/PRs on tolerance; ways of improving the OSCE’s public image and visibility; improving the effectiveness of the OSCE’s interaction and co-operation with other international organizations.

The 2010 discussions within the Corfu process showed that many of the above-mentioned issues remain pertinent, as well as addressed additional areas including co-ordination within and between OSCE executive structures and improving continuity and longer-term planning on a multi-year basis. The participating States welcomed the input to their deliberations by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, and noted the role of think tanks and NGOs in this process.

The Corfu Process highlighted the following areas for possible further discussion:

1. Enhancing the OSCE as a political forum: The participating States could consider ways to strengthen the role and relevance of the OSCE by using it more effectively as a political forum.
2. Strengthening the Legal Framework: The participating States could take forward the discussion on a the draft Convention for the OSCE with a view to providing the OSCE with international legal personality, while continuing the dialogue on strengthening the legal framework of the OSCE and offering continued support to the work of the related Informal Working Group to examine a possible constituent document for the OSCE which can provide the OSCE with distinct legal attributes.
3. Improving Procedures and Practices: The participating States could explore further a host of issues relating to improving practices and procedures -- including staff regulations, periods of service, programme and budget planning, preparing for Ministerial Council meetings, strengthening the work of the executive structures in support of the participating States, reviewing the capacities and effectiveness of the Secretariat and field operations, as well as the practice of holding OSCE meetings in all three dimensions, including their content, duration and participation.

MONDAY, 18 OCTOBER

15:00-18:00 PLENARY SESSION (FORMAL OPENING OF THE VIENNA PART OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE)

This session will formally open the Vienna part of the 2010 Review Conference, which will be focused on three areas: (1) review of the implementation of all OSCE principles and commitments in the politico-military dimension (PMS); (2) review of the implementation of all OSCE principles and commitments in the economic and environmental dimension (EED); and (3) review of OSCE structures and their activities, including consideration of proposals designed to enhance the role of the OSCE and further strengthen its capabilities (OSA). The opening plenary session will address the following agenda items:

1. Formal opening
2. Statement by a representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office
Statement by the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly
Statement by the OSCE Secretary General
3. Reports by:
 - (a) OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities
 - (b) Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation
 - (c) Chairperson of the Security Committee of the Permanent Council
 - (d) Chairperson of the Economic and Environmental Committee of the Permanent Council
 - (e) Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre
4. General debate among the participating States

5. Contributions by:
 - (a) OSCE Partners for Co-operation
 - (b) United Nations
 - (c) Other international organizations, institutions and entities

THURSDAY, 21 OCTOBER

15:00-18:00 SESSION 2: Enhancing the role and further strengthening the capabilities of the OSCE executive structures - Part 2: Lessons learned from field activities

Since 1999, the Organization has achieved significant progress in providing direct assistance to participating States in implementing their OSCE commitments. To that end, the Organization has further developed its comprehensive toolkit for operational support in all three dimensions. Field activities of the Secretariat and institutions continue to remain the main part of operational activities of these executive structures. While located in Vienna, Warsaw and The Hague, the OSCE's central executive structures have increased significantly their direct assistance to participating States on the ground, in close co-operation and co-ordination with OSCE field presences, where available.

As an important part of the OSCE, field operations (FOs) are a unique tool of the Organization and part of its acquis. The past years have been rich in examples of success stories demonstrating the constructive impact of OSCE engagement. Lessons learned from field activities can be identified in several areas, including the wide-ranging role of field operations, comparative advantage, mandate implementation, human and material resources, co-ordination with host countries and international organizations and partners, and internal co-ordination as well as the process of selection and appointment of the FO heads.

Field operations support participating States in strengthening regional security and attaining national priorities through capacity building, partnership and dialogue. Acting in close co-operation with host governments, international community partners and civil society, they provide support and expertise to the authorities, as well as interested individuals, groups and organizations, according to their mandates. In this respect, they help host countries uphold OSCE principles and commitments on a range of issues that span across the three dimensions. FOs also serve as important tools for early warning and, when necessary, as instruments for conflict prevention, conflict management and post-conflict rehabilitation. Furthermore, some FOs function as instruments for mediation and mediation support according to their mandates. The FOs are also increasingly being called upon to support the respective participating State in addressing cross-border, regional and trans-national threats. In all cases, the FOs provide a vital function to participating States for decision making, and where necessary, for collective action, by informing about issues related to the implementation of their mandates, which could have an impact on security and stability.

The FOs maintain close and effective relations with a broad spectrum of actors in government and civil society and are able to react and adapt their work quickly and flexibly to changing circumstances on the ground through a versatile approach, including through advocacy and project activities. The FOs thereby make a significant contribution to the implementation and

sustainability of OSCE decisions. However, the functions served by the field operations – addressing the conflict cycle, helping to uphold OSCE principles and commitments, and working in partnership with and in support of the host country – are not fully independent from the counterparts of field operations. Differences sometimes arise between host countries and other participating States in the interpretation of mandates. Moreover, as recent experience has shown, sometimes participating States are unable to find consensus on the “formula” for the presence of a field operation in crucial situations. To avoid these problems a number participating States proposed to adopt by PC decision general guidelines for FOs activities.

In order to meet current and future challenges, field operations must be able to draw upon adequate financial, human and material resources and advice in order to accomplish the tasks set before them by the participating States. The OSCE’s competitiveness in terms of recruitment and employment conditions needs to be commensurate with the expectations of performance by and within the field operations. The high turnover rate experienced by some FOs leads to gaps in institutional memory, which, when sustained, can have a detrimental impact on their effectiveness.

FOs need to be in a position to co-ordinate their activities with host country authorities, and to be able to evaluate, and where appropriate benchmark, and phase out or hand over those activities that have come to conclusion. Experience has shown that transparent dialogue with the host country, when launching new activities, building up current ones, or downsizing and phasing out activities, has proved beneficial in mandate implementation. Further efforts should be given to co-operation and co-ordination with other international organizations, and to the development of a strategic dialogue at the field level with them.

Field operations are not an isolated instrument, however, but one in a toolbox of many. Thus, the role of the Chairmanship and its Special Representatives and executive structures, including institutions and thematic units as well as the Conflict Prevention Centre, in seeking to prevent and, where necessary, respond to crises is crucial. Co-ordination within the OSCE is currently addressed through the Annual Heads of Mission Meeting and four regional heads of mission meetings, as well as focal point meetings between the institutions and thematic units and the field operations.

Questions that could be raised

- How can we enhance effectiveness of the FOs? How could we further address some open recommendations of the 2005 Panel of Eminent Persons, in particular those related to enhancing field operations?
- Is there a need for thematic presences or regional missions in the OSCE area?
- Should the participating States strengthen the capacities of the Secretariat and institutions to pursue field activities? Is there room for further improving the distribution of labour between the OSCE’s central executive structures and its field presences?
- How can we make better use of the multidimensional and cross-dimensional expertise accumulated by the OSCE’s central executive structures for the maximum benefit of participating States hosting field operations

- How can field operations be further strengthened to conduct activities to mediate or promote dialogue? Or to address the stages of the conflict cycle from early warning to post-conflict rehabilitation, when appropriate?
- How can the reporting function of FOs be further strengthened so that pS have relevant information available in order to better inform their decision making, or that they can better determine when collective action is necessary?
- How can FOs promote second track diplomacy or dialogue with civil society? Or to address regional issues and cross-border contacts?
- What measures can be taken to further link FO co-operation with international and regional organizations within the framework of the 1999 Platform for Co-operative Security?
- How can co-ordination within the OSCE be further strengthened during the planning and budgeting processes?
- How could we further address some open recommendations of the 2005 Panel of Eminent Persons, in particular those related to enhancing field operations?
- To reinforce leadership and management of field operations, is there room for improvement in the selection and appraisal of HoMs and DHoMs?
- In view of better co-ordination between OSCE executive structures, how could field operations' reporting lines be reinforced?
- Can we find ways to identify further financial efficiency across the Organization and leverage previous years large-scale investments in ICT and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) infrastructure?
- How do the FOs realize the transfer of the tasks of the operation to the host country, and consequently the closure of the field operation, according to the paragraph 41 of the Charter for European Security?

TUESDAY, 26 OCTOBER

<p>15:00-18:00 PLENARY SESSION (CLOSURE OF THE VIENNA PART OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE)</p>

The closing plenary session of the Vienna part of the 2010 Review Conference will address the following agenda items:

7. Reports by the rapporteurs and the Chairperson's Summary
8. Formal closure